



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411
312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | ncahlc.org

February 18, 2013

Julie A. Furst-Bowe
Chancellor
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Campus Box 1151
Edwardsville, IL 62026-1151

Dear Chancellor Furst-Bowe:

Enclosed is a copy of Southern Illinois University Edwardsville's *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* in response to the Systems Portfolio submitted under our new process guidelines. You will note that while the format of the report is similar, it is structured differently than earlier Appraisal Reports. We hope you are pleased with the changes. We are also sending your institution's Accreditation Liaison a copy.

To receive maximum benefit from your Systems Appraisal, you and your colleagues should plan to invest substantial time in discussing it, considering the team's observations and advice, and identifying which actions will best advance your institution.

We ask that you formally acknowledge receipt of this report within the next two weeks, and provide us with any comments you wish to make about it. Your response will become part of your institution's permanent HLC file. Please email your response to AQIP@hlcommission.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mary L. Green". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mary L. Green
AQIP Process Administrator

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

**SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
EDWARDSVILLE**

February 14, 2013



**Academic
Quality Improvement
Program**

The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7500

Chicago, Illinois 60604

www.AQIP.org

AQIP@hlcommission.org

800-621-7440

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

In response to the *Systems Portfolio* of
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
EDWARDSVILLE



Academic
Quality Improvement
Program

The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

February 14, 2013

Table of Contents

Elements of the Feedback Report	1
Reflective Introduction and Executive Summary	3
Strategic Challenges	11
AQIP Category Feedback	14
<i>Helping Students Learn</i>	14
<i>Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives</i>	21
<i>Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs</i>	24
<i>Valuing People</i>	27
<i>Leading and Communicating</i>	31
<i>Supporting Institutional Operations</i>	34
<i>Measuring Effectiveness</i>	37
<i>Planning Continuous Improvement</i>	40
<i>Building Collaborative Relationships</i>	42
Accreditation Issues	44
Quality of Systems Portfolio	52
Using the Feedback Report	52

ELEMENTS OF Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville's FEEDBACK REPORT

Welcome to the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*. This report provides AQIP's official response to an institution's *Systems Portfolio* by a team of peer reviewers (the Systems Appraisal Team). After the team independently reviews the institution's portfolio, it reaches consensus on essential elements of the institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by AQIP Category, and any significant issues related to accreditation. These are then presented in three sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*: "Strategic Challenges Analysis," "AQIP Category Feedback," and "Accreditation Issues Analysis." These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating institutional performance, surfacing critical issues or accreditation concerns, and assessing institutional performance. Ahead of these three areas, the team provides a "Reflective Introduction" followed closely by an "Executive Summary." The appraisal concludes with commentary on the overall quality of the report and advice on using the report. Each of these areas is overviewed below.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team has only the institution's *Systems Portfolio* to guide its analysis of the institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently the team's report may omit important strengths, particularly if the institution was too modest to stress them or if discussion or documentation of these areas in the *Systems Portfolio* were presented minimally. Similarly the team may point out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving wide-spread institutional attention. Indeed it is possible that some areas recommended for potential improvement have since become strengths rather than opportunities through the institution's ongoing efforts. Recall that the overarching goal of the Systems Appraisal Team is to provide an institution with the best possible advice for ongoing improvement.

The various sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* can be described as follows:

Reflective Introduction & Executive Summary: In this first section of the *System's Appraisal Feedback Report*, the team provides a summative statement that reflects its broad understanding of the institution and the constituents served (Reflective Introduction), and also the team's overall judgment regarding the institution's current performance in relation to the nine AQIP Categories (Executive Summary). In the Executive Summary, the team considers such factors as: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback; and systematic processes for improvement of

the activities that each AQIP Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

Strategic Challenges Analysis: Strategic challenges are those most closely related to an institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Teams formulate judgments related to strategic challenges and accreditation issues (discussed below) through careful analysis of the Organizational Overview included in the institution's Systems Portfolio and through the team's own feedback provided for each AQIP Category. These collected findings offer a framework for future improvement of processes and systems.

AQIP Category Feedback: The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* addresses each AQIP Category by identifying (and also coding) strengths and opportunities for improvement. An **S** or **SS** identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by **O**, with **OO** indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Through comments, which are keyed to the institution's Systems Portfolio, the team offers brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by AQIP Category, and presenting the team's findings in detail, this section is often considered the heart of the *Feedback Report*.

Accreditation Issues Analysis: Accreditation issues are areas where an institution may have not yet provided sufficient evidence that it meets the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*. It is also possible that the evidence provided suggests to the team that the institution may have difficulties, whether at present or in the future, in satisfying the *Criteria*. As with strategic challenges, teams formulate judgments related to accreditation issues through close analysis of the entire Systems Portfolio with particular attention given to the evidence that the institution provides for satisfying the various core components of the *Criteria*. For purposes of consistency, AQIP instructs appraisal teams to identify any accreditation issue as a strategic challenge as well.

Quality of Report & Its Use: As with any institutional report, the *Systems Portfolio* should work to enhance the integrity and credibility of the organization by celebrating successes while also stating honestly those opportunities for improvement. The *Systems Portfolio* should therefore be transformational, and it should provide external peer reviewers insight as to how such transformation may occur through processes of continuous improvement. The AQIP Categories and the Criteria for Accreditation serve as the overarching measures for the institution's current state as well as its proposed future state. As such, it is imperative that the *Portfolio* be fully developed, that it adhere to

the prescribed format, and that it be thoroughly vetted for clarity and correctness. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution following this review, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

REFLECTIVE INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, EDWARDSVILLE

The following consensus statement is from the System Appraisal Team's review of the institution's *Systems Portfolio Overview* and its introductions to the nine AQIP Categories. The purpose of this reflective introduction is to highlight the team's broad understanding of the institution, its mission, and the constituents that it serves.

- SIUE is a long-standing and more mature AQIP institution that takes an intentional approach to continuous improvement by using the language and framework of AQIP in institutional operations. For example, charging a committee (i.e., the University Quality Council) with the use of data to monitor and continuously improve specific key processes is commendable. Additionally, the causal linkages between data collection, analysis, and actions taken to make improvements (i.e., the assessment loop) are made explicit in the goal setting and goal monitoring processes of the Strategic Plan goals and in decisions made regarding budget allocations. Moreover, SIUE intentionally fosters a culture of continuous improvement, as evidenced by the positioning of the University Quality Council to provide a leadership-level perspective on the institution's quality agenda and oversight for Action Projects.
- Given the institution's commitment to AQIP principles and the continuation of this commitment under the newly appointed Chancellor, observations in this report about SIUE's processes, results, and improvements relative to the nine AQIP Categories are focused on advancing the quality agenda and, in most instances, further maturing practices that might be deemed laudable in an institution at the threshold of the AQIP pathway.

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

- SIUE has a strong framework for assessment that includes (for all undergraduate academic programs except General Education) a Senior Assignment, and an assessment plan/annual reporting requirement. The capstone experience (i.e., the Senior Assignment) provides the cornerstone for assessment of undergraduate program-level student learning outcomes. For both undergraduate and graduate programs, SIUE has common learning objectives and standardized program review and approval processes that ensure the involvement of all key stakeholders. These processes support empirically based program planning and improvement. Advancements can be made through standardizing the criteria for the Senior Assignment assessment, tying formative assessments to this summative assessment, and expanding the use of multiple assessments within all programs.

Review and revision of the general education program (2004-2007) involved intensive collaborative work, and SIUE is transitioning to full implementation of the Lincoln Program. SIUE faces an exciting yet daunting challenge as it identifies a manageable and assessable set of core competencies associated with the core dimensions, “skills,” “breadth,” “interdisciplinary Studies,” and “experiences.” Further, SIUE has before it the tasks of developing cross-disciplinary assessment processes for its core learning outcomes, mapping these core outcomes to the outcomes of all academic programs, and identifying ways the general education assessment process maximizes the use of data already available on campus. The six core undergraduate student outcomes and five graduate student outcomes need to be the focal point of improvement efforts moving forward.

SIUE has made important progress in moving toward fully integrated student support systems through the creation of its Student Success Center. The mandatory, every term advisement policy for undergraduates and the comprehensive nature of services offered in this single Center lay the groundwork for true integration in systems and processes for supporting student success.

SIUE reports results from ongoing assessments of student learning support services (e.g., library; housing); however, these assessments focus on student use of and satisfaction with services. Focusing on the actual effectiveness of the services and developing valid measures of student support services’ impact on student learning could take these processes to the aligned (or perhaps even the integrated) level.

All programs are encouraged to monitor the success and career readiness of graduates through multiple measures. Requiring the use of a minimum array of assessments, including formative

assessments, and making processes for assessing learning outcomes at the program level less insular—perhaps through the introduction of common measures—would further mature these processes.

SIUE's processes for program review appear to yield high quality 8-year reviews and 4-year interim reports, and the university has in place a program-review process involving internal and external review of self studies. Advancing this process from systematic to aligned and integrated may entail 1) the creation of processes for sharing and benchmarking graduates' successes through the use of common measures, 2) process for aggregating and/or reviewing key results across all or generally related programs, and 3) use of common benchmarks against which select data on student learning might be analyzed across all programs.

- SIUE identifies four distinctive objectives (i.e., the East St. Louis Charter High School, NCAA Division I status, the University Park, and externally funded research and contracts). These objectives are framed by the strategic plan and guided by input from the internal SIUE community, major stakeholders, and the community at large. Institutional leadership selects these four activities as the best means of advancing the long-term goals of the Strategic Plan, and monitoring the overall impact of these four activities is currently achieved as part of ongoing assessment of the strategic plan (i.e., the measures identified for each of the long-term goals will fluctuate according to the success or failure of the athletics program, the University Park, the grants office, and the East St. Louis Center). Monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of each objective is done via internal personnel applying internally developed measures.

Each of these four objectives is an enormous undertaking that involves budget, physical space, and staff resources. Given the reliance on external and internal funding as well as the external collaborative relationships needed for each to be successful, it is critical that SIUE develop and implement broad, high-level, publically shared measures of the degree to which each activity contributes to the Strategic Plan. In the short term, mapping the impact of these activities on the long-term goals may, at the very least, reveal or suggest goals that could be better advanced through alternative or redesigned activities.

SIUE has a keen interest in growing and developing a national athletic presence as evidenced by the recent application to and certification by the NCAA as a Division I institution. Institutional processes at this point are systematic, with regular evaluation occurring at several levels. Further development of continuous improvement processes related to the ongoing maintenance of this

designation will strengthen the endeavor. For example, as SIUE continues its partnership with NCAA at this new, higher level, it will be important not to slip into a reactive mode of simply ensuring compliance with the myriad of regulations.

Evidence of strong processes designed to serve external stakeholders is given in the form of external recognitions. For example, the institution has been recognized for its “commitment to the public good” and named to the President’s Higher Education community service Honor roll in the Distinction category. The St. Louis Center and American Red Cross projects further demonstrate the strength the alignment of its non-instructional objectives to SIUE’s mission of public service.

- SIUE exhibits a pattern of creating comprehensive service and support functions (e.g., the Student Success Center and the Kimmel Leadership Center) that are co-located and reciprocally supportive. This pattern reflects a focus on the student perspective and makes possible close integration of the processes and services. Activities, such as Springboard to Success, overnight orientation, New Student Orientation/Convocation, and Welcome Week, establish relationships with students. Relationships are maintained through a variety of opportunities, such as advising, surveys, focus groups, dialogue with the Chancellor, residence hall programming, university housing curriculum, and student affairs activities.

Maturing processes under Category 3 will involve promoting consistency across programs and services in the collection and use of data to drive improvements and taking its use of institutional-level student satisfaction data to the next level of usefulness by analyzing the data at lower levels of accountability and/or setting stretch targets for improving specific results. Longitudinal data seems absent, as do processes for aggregating data across programs and units for use by the UQC or executive leadership.

Students of SUIE have many venues for expressing or formally reporting complaints and concerns (as listed in 3P6), and concerns and complaints are evaluated at the departmental, school, or university level. Processes for reviewing all complaints and concerns could be better integrated across departments and colleges so that campus-wide themes could be detected and, if appropriate, responded to.

SUIE acknowledges that monitoring and responding to external stakeholder needs could benefit from better alignment and integration of processes. A place to start may be a formal review and definition of the institution’s key external stakeholders. A broad campus conversation about who

are SIUE's key external stakeholders may suggest or lead to a framework for monitoring and meeting these stakeholders' needs in a more integrated manner.

With its history of continuous improvement and using multiple data sources SIUE has a unique opportunity to be a model for how these various efforts can be more clearly interconnected. The University can demonstrate processes of insuring that goals are measurable as they are developed; identifying what data will be collected, at what time, to monitor progress; specifying when corrections are implemented; and identifying success would truly complete the loop. This represents a significant challenge, but SIUE appears capable of meeting the challenge

- SIUI has solid processes for hiring, orienting, training, evaluating and rewarding staff and faculty and demonstrates its commitment to valuing people through its Core Values statement. SIUE's long-term strategic goals of achieving a harmonious campus climate and ensuring the commitment of faculty and staff are bold goals that are matched with data-producing measures in its Strategic Plan assessment documentation. Combining UCLA Study data, NSSE results, and the results of alumni surveys to get perspective on achievement of these goals is an example of integrating assessment and planning effectively.

SIUE's employee recognition and reward mechanisms are systematic and imaginative. Such steps as providing time and support to complete a degree, intramural funding for faculty scholarly work, and even a month of preferred parking can be powerful messages that the Institution truly values employees.

However, the offering and funding of faculty development activities appear to arise from many units and sources on campus and may be more reactionary than pro-active. For staff and administrators, SIUE's professional development programs are reactive, based, as they are, on recent constituent surveys. Administrators and chairs, while included in SIUE's valuing people action plans, are not as strongly supported as other constituencies, such as staff members. SIUE's Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) process appears to be an effective means of monitoring the appropriateness of compensation for internal staff positions, as was pointed out in the last Systems Appraisal Report. For administrative positions, a version of this process could be highly useful in monitoring performance—especially in the areas of “impact / accountability,” problem solving / decision making,” “freedom to act,” and “working conditions.”

Further, energies and expenditures could be optimized for development activities across the board by aligning planning in this area with the strategic planning process. For example, identifying

core competencies (rooted in the Institution's mission and vision) for all employees in various capacities could provide an aligned or integrated framework for professional development, and this framework could be used in mapping all current development and training initiatives campus wide to see if optimum use is being made of funding, time, and energy.

- Shared governance, transparency, and data, all seem to inform SIUE strategic planning process. Currently, SIUE has a clear and readily understandable yearly cycle for setting and renewing short-term goals based on strategic goals. A bidirectional planning and budget processes facilitated by leadership emphasizes ongoing communication. The simplicity of the process and the links between budgeting and progress on short- and long-term goals foster transparency; however, the budgeting process may benefit from embedded evaluation which would further integrate it into the organization's culture.

As the institution conducts a new round of strategic planning, it plans to incorporate specific best practice lessons, including: 1) honor the previous work of the institution, 2) get president and board of trustees support for the process, 3) establishing the planning committee, 4) constituent conversations, 5) the vision, mission and core values must emerge from the conversation, 6) develop strategic priorities from the vision, mission and core values, and 7) within the strategic priorities, establish areas of focus with measureable outcomes.

Renewed attention to strategic planning and the review of SIUE's mission and vision may provide an opportunity for broad conversations about the institution's values. Revision to the institution's values need not be the intent of such conversations, and soliciting input on the lived values that constituents perceive SIUE as embodying could reinforce shared values and/or point out discrepancies between what is stated and what is perceived by constituents.

SIUE actively solicits faculty feedback regarding communicating and leadership. There is an opportunity for the university to actively seek feedback from staff as well. Correlating feedback from staff and faculty may further inform the university regarding opportunities for improvement.

A multi-tiered yet traditional and hierarchical communication system keeps all internal stakeholders informed. These processes are systematic but might be pushed into an aligned level through concerted efforts to develop and sustain broader, University-wide communication mechanisms. Bridging this gap is inherently difficult on a large, diverse campus.

- SIUE support for institutional operations is integrated; the maturity of these processes is perhaps best exemplified in the development and operation of the relatively new Student Success Center. The Portfolio describes the design, implementation, and ongoing improvement of this facility as a collaborative effort drawing on multiple University constituencies and maintaining a clear focus on its ultimate purpose – supporting student learning. More generally, the University regularly measures outcomes for a wide variety of support processes, and a strong strategic planning process and an effective University Planning and Budget Committee have guided the institution through the tough economic times despite the Illinois budget crisis.

SIUE incorporates four key processes associated with stages in the typical student lifecycle to identify student support needs. These processes are aligned with key support entities and processes within the university, and creation of a physical space (i.e., the Student Success Center) where wrap-around services are co-located greatly reinforces the interdependence of separate service units in providing integrated support services to students.

Nonetheless, units and areas providing student support services and administrative support services independently evaluate effectiveness in identifying and meeting constituent needs. A recently retired Action Project resulted in a review process and schedule for the review of the effectiveness of all administrative and student support units. If the review process does not contain common elements that enable reviewers to identify specific services for improvement or allow for understanding constituent satisfaction in specific colleges or areas (as opposed to general, overall satisfaction), an opportunity for further integration may exist. In sum, SIUE has well established processes in place but will benefit from further aligning activities, key performance indicators, and outcomes with key planning processes. Doing so may result in more meaningful and actionable data that is gathered, analyzed, evaluated, and incorporated into decision-making processes.

- SIUE regards processes in this category as reflecting an integrated level of maturity. Distinctive structures for communicating and reinforcing the emphasis the institution places on taking a systems approach to continuous improvement and data-driven decision making include the existence of a standing committee whose primary responsibility is to monitor the effectiveness of specific processes. The strategic planning process that establishes and monitors the institution's short and long-term institutional goals works in tandem with this committee, (i.e., the University Quality Council) to make recommendations for AQIP action projects. Additionally, SIUE

facilitates discussions regarding institutional data through a recently initiated annual Continuous Improvement Conference, which appears to be a substantial venue for promoting a culture of performance excellence. Continued development of program offerings and evaluation of attendee experiences and the degree to which the conference informs operations may better guide the university regarding full integration and transference of learning into action.

Lastly, while SIUE uses the mission and vision as tools for selecting measures; engages campus stakeholders broadly in discussing results and identifying improvement opportunities; and regularly updates approaches as needs and opportunities arise, the text notes that these processes are fluid, modified in response to user needs on an iterative basis. It could be unkind, but not unfair, to describe these processes as reactive in that regard.

- SIUE has integrated planning processes; these processes encompass unit-level plans as well as an institutional strategic plan, and budgeting. SIUE monitors key systems through its strategic planning processes and systematically develops AQIP Action Projects. Short and long-term goals are monitored annually using measurable outcomes and clear metrics. These processes are responsive to both external and internal threats and opportunities. Nonetheless, as SIUE continues to mature as an AQIP institution, efforts need to be focused on actual results, data analysis, and improvements based upon results. The tracking of long-term progression is also important.

While a focus on goal attainment should be at the forefront attaining goals is not a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the planning process itself. Looking at how the overall process works can help ensure effective use of resources and the basing of decisions on relevant and reliable processes. Given the difficulty of obtaining performance measures for sister institutions' planning processes and SIUE's experience with AQIP, the institution could make a landmark contribution to the higher education community by developing reliable and transferrable processes for obtaining these data, thus enabling benchmarking in this area.

SIUE actively assesses risk but may benefit from integrating more formal risk assessment practices that incorporate industry comparisons and from formalizing the risk assessment framework by incorporating specific operational categories including strategic, operational, technological, financial, and reputational elements. Additionally the risk management process may be enhanced by incorporating a ranking system that judge potential impacts on the organization and the probability of occurrence.

- Techniques SIUE uses to maintain an emphasis on creating, prioritizing, and building relationships with educational institutions and employers in the region while aligning internal needs with external stakeholder needs include the practice of using real-world problems identified by local companies to serve as the basis for Senior Assignments for speech communication, health education, mechanical engineering, civil engineering, and industrial engineering. Relations are further enhanced by involving the contributing organizations in the review of the Senior Assignment critiques.

SIUE primarily receives students from three types of institutions: high schools, community colleges and regional education and business organizations. Identifying additional prospect pools may become more critical as a result of increased regional and national competition, changing demographics, and employment trends, and economic conditions. Thus far, SIUE has been able to ensure that partner relationships are meeting the needs of the entities involved through primarily informal and reactive measures, there is an opportunity to formalize processes related to measuring the effectiveness of the partner relationships.

Additionally, SIUE may want to explore how comprehensively external relationships are managed. “Agility” is one of the qualities of High Performance Organizations under AQIP, and high-level processes for monitoring the full range of external relations would help SIUE respond quickly to changing needs and opportunities. Since SIUE tracks results for building collaborative relationships through its long term Goal 5, “Active community Engagement,” there is opportunity to more closely analyze individual relationships and the array of partnerships as a whole. Doing so may answer questions, such as “What areas have a history of long, productive relationships and why have they been successful?” “What areas have a limited or unproductive relationships and why?” “How and to what degree do our collaborative relationships enhance the mission, vision, and goals of the University?” “How do we communicate our mission, vision, and goals to our partners, and how are our relationships changing over time?”

Note: Strategic challenges and accreditation issues are discussed in detail in subsequent sections of the *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*.

STRATEGIC CHALLENGES FOR Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the Systems Appraisal Team attempted to identify the broader issues that would seem to present the greatest challenges and opportunities for the institution in the coming years. These areas are ones that the institution should address as it seeks to become the institution it wants to be. From these the institution may discover its immediate priorities as well as shaping strategies for long-term performance improvement. These items may also serve as the basis for future activities and projects that satisfy other AQIP requirements. The team also considered whether any of these challenges put the institution at risk of not meeting the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*. That portion of the team's work is presented later in this report.

Knowing that Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville will discuss these strategic challenges, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified the following:

- While SIUE clearly has solid processes and structures in place for the assessment of student learning and development, further development and integration of processes merits the university's strategic attention. Specifically, the Senior Assignment could be standardized (to a degree) through campus-wide development of criterion-referenced assessment tools and tying program-level formative assessments to this summative assessment. As SIUE develops a manageable and assessable set of general education core competencies associated with the core dimensions, "skills," "breadth," "interdisciplinary Studies," and "experiences," opportunities will arise to establish cross-disciplinary assessment processes, to map these core outcomes to the outcomes of all academic programs, and to identify ways the general education assessment process maximizes the use of data already available on campus. Further, the assessment of student development should be wrapped into this endeavor by mapping the institution's 2013-2016 priorities regarding co-curricular development goals with some or all of the outcomes defined in the Lincoln Program. A more explicit alignment of extra-curricular activities with shared outcomes would further integrate SIUE's assessment processes.
- SIUE is a data-driven institution that acts intentionally to imbue a culture of data analysis campus wide, as evidenced by online publication of the Strategic Plan, the goals, the measures, and some results. The results sections of the portfolio presented little data clearly tied to anticipated outcomes, and the text seldom offered interpretations to assist reviewers in understanding how the institution viewed or reflected on the data. Advancing SIUE's quality agenda in regard to how

data is analyzed and used should include efforts to introduce into already extant measures (e.g., program reviews, employee annual reviews, yearly college reports, advisory board reports, the individually developed assessments of student and/or administrative support services, etc.) common measures that would allow for the aggregation and/or cross-area analysis of effectiveness. Executive leadership at SIUE could benefit from having the means to generate a composite view of specific institutional operations or services.

A more systematic approach to data analysis may be achieved by analyzing the data (e.g., NSSE, HERI results) at lower levels of accountability and/or setting stretch targets for improving specific results. Longitudinal data may be used but is not presented in the portfolio to any substantial degree. More interpretation or contextual analysis of results by leadership, the setting of stretch targets, and a more thorough approach to tying data to specific improvements are all strategic actions SIUE could take to advance its quality agenda. To aid in closing the continuous quality loop (to bridge the data gap), an opportunity exists for the University to showcase how actual data informs the improvements represented in the portfolio. Closing these data loops will help SIUE achieve even higher levels of maturity as an AQIP institution.

- The efforts SIUE is taking to integrate functional units and improve both communication and efficiency can be seen in the creation of the Student Success Center and the co-location of services. Strategic opportunities appear to exist to repeat this pattern of close integration in other functional areas. For example, the developmental schema used by the Student Success Center to frame the functions and services of the Center could serve as a basis for the development of assessments with common elements of all co-located services. The units offering and funding faculty development activities are another cluster of independently functioning entities that could be more closely integrated via information sharing, service-mapping, or commonalities in how they assess effectiveness and impact. Units providing student support services and administrative support services independently evaluate effectiveness in identifying and meeting constituent needs, and, in the absence of common or shared measures, institutional leadership relies on broad measures of student satisfaction that may not be as effective as they could be in pinpointing where improvements can be made. As a last example, the units and entities responding to external stakeholder needs and community partnerships could benefit from better alignment and integration of processes. A place to start may be a formal review and definition of the institution's key external stakeholders.

AQIP CATEGORY FEEDBACK

In the following section, the Systems Appraisal Team delineates institutional strengths along with opportunities for improvement within the nine AQIP Categories. As explained above, the symbols used in this section are **SS** for outstanding strength, **S** for strength, **O** for opportunity for improvement, and **OO** for outstanding opportunity for improvement. The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the team members and deserves the institution's thoughtful consideration. Comments marked **SS** or **OO** may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn: This category identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. It focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet it also addresses how the entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery, faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling, learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 1.

SIUE has a distinctively strong framework for assessment, and all programs are encouraged to monitor the success and career readiness of graduates through multiple measures. Review and revision of the general education program is complete, and the institution is in the process of transitioning to full implementation of the Lincoln Program. Identifying a manageable and assessable set of core competencies associated with the core dimensions, "skills," "breadth," "interdisciplinary Studies," and "experiences," is a next step that promises to reveal opportunities for greater integration of assessment processes and closer alignment of the curriculum and co-curriculum. Advancing the integration of learning outcome assessment for all programs will entail making processes less insular—perhaps through the introduction of common measures or instruments that would enable the aggregation and analysis of data across programs.

In the area of student support systems, SIUE has greatly advanced integration of processes through the creation of its Student Success Center. True integration of support processes will entail developing measures of student support services' impact on student learning and assessments that enable leadership to monitor effectiveness across support and service units.

Program review at SIUE also benefits from a strong framework, and advancing these processes from systematic to aligned and integrated may entail the creation of measures and benchmarks common to all programs that can be aggregated and analyzed by institutional leaders.

1P1, SS. SIUE has recently completed a review of common learning outcomes for undergraduate students and has in queue an Action Project to form a General Education Assessment Committee that will develop a comprehensive plan for the assessment of learning outcomes held in common across all academic programs and student support units.

1P2, S. SIUE has a multi-dimensional, faculty-driven process for determining learning objectives, as reported in the Annual Performance Report. The process includes specific competencies students should have before completing a program. Performance indicators are used to determine a program's success with regards to students meeting programmatic learning outcomes. Opportunities to move the institution's assessment process to the next, higher level may lie in the area of setting higher minimum expectations for the types, levels, and periodicity of assessments used by all academic programs.

1P3, O. How SIUE proactively determines emerging needs or regional trends in order to develop programs that are competitive with those offered by other organizations is unclear. An opportunity may exist to establish a cycle of environmental scanning at the institutional or inter-institutional level with the aim of identifying new programs and courses. Regular, publically shared environmental-scanning processes that include the solicitation of input from advisory boards, corporate partners, and other external stakeholders could help ensure a thorough inquiry into emerging needs, trends, and markets and enhance constituent confidence in the currency and relevance of SIUE's academic offerings.

1P4a, S. SIUE has a thorough process for developing, assessing, evaluating, and refining each program (with the exception of general education) through a self-study process. This was cited in the previous Systems Appraisal as a strength and continues to be so.

1P4b, O. SIUE's Portfolio describes various mechanisms through which the University obtains and uses information about programs' usefulness to community stakeholders. One mechanism, the program review process, might benefit from more systematically incorporating the feedback obtained from the regional and professional communities as significant dimensions of the evaluation process. Additionally, review processes could be further strengthened to ensure all students are prepared to work in diverse cultural settings—perhaps via the use of some common measure of learning in the areas of global awareness and economic, political, and demographic trends affecting the global workplace.

1P5, O. Although SIUE incorporates Illinois State Board of Education High School Graduation course requirements, ACT composite scores, and high school grade point averages in the admission decision evaluation process, there is no indication of feeding summative assessment into the process for determining needed levels of preparation. An opportunity exists to move this process to the next level by creating a continuous feedback loop that uses results from the senior project and other checkpoints to monitor information about needed preparation and to monitor the quality of academic support services.

1P6, S. SIUE has numerous communication, support, and marketing strategies to share student expectations for each degree, including admission events, via the catalog and online, through advising, and via software which provides degree audit capabilities. In addition, freshmen are required to attend a “Springboard to Success” designed to communicate expectations for college level performance.

1P7, SS. Mandatory advising and the co-location of student support services in a Student Success Center are strong practices at SIUE, and these practices are greatly strengthened by framing academic advising as an educational process and the use of a developmental schema for goal setting, career planning, and the nurturing of individual autonomy. The

system might be enhanced by empowering students to take control of their own planning and progression. Using the existing systems and support to provide intensive early intervention that leads to empowering students and helping them develop their own portfolios or guides with measurable accomplishments would not only enable students to take control of their learning, it would help the University measure how well it is meeting the goals of its students.

1P8, S. The dual-admission program is an exemplary approach to inter-university collaboration and outreach. This program can enhance enrollment at both SIUE and the community college(s) involved, and support student success at SIUE.

1P9, O. The topics cited for faculty development programming to address student learning styles and human brain learning reflect a high level of sophistication on SIUE's part in fostering faculty understanding of different learning styles. An opportunity exists to build upon this by expanding faculty training in learning styles, creating opportunities to enable students to analyze and understand their own learning styles, and moving SIUE's processes in this area to a higher level through the setting of measurable goals for faculty use of technologies and techniques that support different learning styles.

1P10, S.

1P11, S.

1P12a, S. SIUE maintains strong planning and budgeting processes that serves as the foundation for all institutional programs. SIUE could enhance resource allocation and ensure a continuous focus on instructional quality by expanding its existing process of prioritizing academic programs. Currently, new initiatives are prioritized at the School/College level. Schools and Colleges could ensure that limited resources are best used by prioritizing all course/program offerings, existing and long-standing as well as new. The strong program review process provides ample current information for incorporating all offerings into the prioritization process. Expanding the prioritization process in this way could help keep resource allocations current and appropriate.

1P12b, O. SIUE employs a variety of teaching styles and delivery methods and incorporates a range of educational technologies. However, more evidence is needed related to the process of matching student needs and organizational requirements to the choice of course delivery options. The E-Learning at SIUE plan and its focus on expanding on-line, blended, and distant learning opportunities may create an opportunity to advance other goals, such as encouraging faculty members to use technologies and techniques to support an array of learning styles and to set personal goals or institutional minimum expectations for professional development in pedagogy.

1P13, O. While SIUE's program review processes provide strong support for maintaining the currency of individual academic programs, the University appears to have an opportunity to create regular processes for reviewing its overall program array. Creation of institutional-level program review processes could emerge from the use by program-review committees of common measures, metrics, or rubrics that are more in depth and useful for planning purposes than the three categories cited (i.e., in good standing, flagged for priority review, or enrollment suspended).

1P14, O. SIUE follows standardized processes for course and program approval, modification, and discontinuation; however, more emphasis seems to be placed on the mechanics of the process rather than the assessment and evaluation that needs to occur to drive decisions that lead to approval, modification and discontinuation. An opportunity exists to use input from advisory committees and other outside sources to help determine the relevance of courses and to help with changing or discontinuing courses. The University would also be well-served by developing criteria for criterion-referenced descriptions of what constitutes a strong program and articulating the steps that will be taken to help struggling programs.

1P15, O. Though the Portfolio asserts in the context of this Category that the Institution is committed to faculty members' development as teachers and scholars, no information about University support for faculty members' scholarly development is provided. Common mechanisms (e.g., released time for research activity and writing; undergraduate and/or graduate research assistants; intramural research funding; assistance

in pursuing and administering external research funding) should be described or cross referenced.

1P16, S. SIUE identifies 2013-2016 priorities regarding co-curricular development goals and curricular learning objectives; however, given the ambitious and difficult-to-assess nature of some of the outcomes defined in the Lincoln Program, a more explicit mapping of extra-curricular activities with shared outcomes may provide better support for learning and clearer integration of all aspects of the SIUE experience.

1P17, S. The University monitors a number of key indicators of student success to see if students are meeting learning expectations and whether the institution remains strongly committed to student success. Adding in information from the senior project classes and/or student portfolios or other direct measures of student growth would build upon the current system and move the assessment of student learning to the next level. For example, SIUE might consider asking employers objective and specific questions about SIUE graduates' preparation and performance relative to graduates of other universities.

1P18, S.

1R1, O. The Senior Assignment, while a strength of student learning outcome assessment at SIUE, could be leveraged to make outcomes assessment more integrated through the introduction of common criterion-referenced or rubric-defined standards for subject-matter proficiency and the demonstration higher-level common outcomes, such as critical thinking and creativity. Further, SIUE might gain additional insight into students' and programs' successes by incorporating external evaluations of Senior Assignments—perhaps by advisory board members, alumni employers, or notably successful alumni.

1R2, O. The University recognizes the need to develop a more comprehensive assessment of general education that includes setting achievable and measurable goals, measuring the progress toward achieving those goals, recognizing successes, recommending improvement and assessing overall results.

1R3a, O. SIUE does not disaggregate and link results to specific learning objectives. Figure 1.4 presents results for the senior assignment. Segmenting results by specific

learning objectives for each program may help the institution better understand more fully how their student are performing against learning objectives.

IR3b, O. In addition, while each program has unique measures to measure student achievement of programmatic standards, commonalities in the senior assignment might be established through the use of basic rubrics or definitions that accompany the ratings of “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “does not meet expectations.” Student development and growth from admittance to graduation could be continually monitored and evaluated. Efforts to unify and index expectations for achievement across all programs could lead to higher overall standards that would avoid results such as having 96% percent of all students exceeding or meeting expectations.

1R4, S.

1R5, O. SIUE could improve its approach to assessing the performance of learning support units. The Portfolio reports traditional measures in this area (e.g., cost/unit, usage levels, consumer satisfaction). Identifying valid measures of the actual impact that units such as the library, academic advising, the campus union, housing, and the like have on students’ academic performance would be a valuable contribution to higher education generally and beneficial to SIUE specifically. The use of qualitative assessment techniques, such as focus groups or targeted surveys, might enable SIUE to acquire input on students not currently making use of the library and to use this data to continually improve services. This information would be especially useful in eras of constrained finances, when faculty and administrators must decide which learning support programs justify continued support. Limited data is provided, which indicates a significant opportunity for the institution to more fully understand its performance of its processes that support ‘helping students learn’.

1R6, O. For fields or disciplines without external certification or licensure testing, the portfolio does not provide results or comparative benchmarks for processes related to helping students learn.

III, O. The University does a good job of developing innovative and constructive improvements to foster student learning. These initiatives align well with the university's mission and vision. They also appear to grow out of identified needs. It would be helpful to make these connections more obvious, however. For example, what data/results were used to identify the various initiatives? How will these initiatives be evaluated to ensure they are successful? How will the results be used to drive improvement? Without clearly linking the initiatives to identified needs it is hard to tell how these are related to the university's ongoing assessment and commitment to continuous improvement.

II2, S. The institution presents evidence of being committed to furthering a continuous quality improvement culture, a key theme of being an AQIP institution. Gathering, sharing, and using data for decision making is emphasized in the portfolio. With systematic quality initiatives and accreditation under the same reporting structure, institution-wide continuity and oversight appears to be enhanced. Innovative groups, such as The University Quality Council, appear to help drive continuous quality within the culture of SIUE.

AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives: This category addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of the institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of its mission. Depending on the institution's character, it examines the institution's processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 2.

SIUE has four clearly delineated "distinctive objectives" (i.e., the East St. Louis Charter High School, NCAA Division I status, the University Park, and externally funded research and contracts), selected as such for their impact on advancing the long-term goals of the Strategic Plan. Monitoring the effectiveness of these four activities is currently achieved as part of ongoing and overall assessment of the strategic plan. While aligning these activities may not be feasible or useful, each of these four objectives

is an enormous, resource-intensive undertaking; therefore, mapping the impact of these activities to the long-term goals and exploring possible commonalities in how the effectiveness of each activity is measured may confirm that they are optimum activities for advancing the long-term goals or suggest that alternative activities should be considered.

2P1, S. The other distinctive objectives described in the portfolio align with SIUE's long-term objectives, mission, values and goals and are incorporated into the strategic plan such that monitoring progress on achieving these objectives doubles as an ongoing assessment of these activities and involvements. The University Planning and Budget Committee serves in a vital capacity for general oversight of all planning activities including environmental scanning, SWOT analyses, and resource allocation.

2P2a, O. How SIUE determines its non-instructional objectives for external stakeholders is not described. SIUE explains (see pages 36 & 37) how decision making and goal setting is accomplished by the President and Board of Trustees in conjunction with the Office of Research and Projects; however, how the institution's non-instructional objectives are established in the first place is unclear. A broader, higher-level, and systematic process for environmental scanning may reveal non-instructional objectives and external stakeholder needs not yet considered by the University or reveal more impactful community-related initiatives which may further support the mission, vision, and values of the University.

2P2b, OO. Each of SIUE's other distinctive objectives represents a significant undertaking and investment. Each has an operational lifespan longer than the strategic plan and, perhaps, beyond the scope of oversight that can be provided by the University Planning and Budgeting Committee (UPBC). It is unlikely, for example, that the UPBC would defund athletics or suggest the elimination or initiation of a distinctive objective. An opportunity clearly exists to establish a process or framework at the executive leadership level for reviewing all non-instructional objectives for overall impact, effectiveness, and return on investment.

2P3, O. Expectations for each distinctive objective are communicated in general terms via a standard array of media and modes and linked to the seven long-term goals of the University. How leadership communicates specific expectations to the personnel responsible for the various commitments is not described. An opportunity exists to establish a stronger communication network, perhaps through the University Quality Council, with those who administer SIUE's

other objectives. Reporting to the campus at large clear goals and progress-toward-goals for each objective could better integrate these activities into the university's overall quality agenda.

2P4, O. SIUE has in place a comprehensive and integrated planning process that includes a review and assessment of the appropriateness and value of non-instructional objectives within the context of the regional economic development strategies. The East ST. Louis Center is subject to review every five years when its charter is renewed, and University Park operations are reviewed as part of periodic regional economic development strategic planning. However, no regular review processes are described for athletics or the grants office.

2P5, O. While SIUE has begun to develop mechanisms to ensure consideration of faculty and staff needs, additional work on feedback loops is to be encouraged. Process-flow diagrams (or flow charts) illustrating how information on faculty and staff needs is fed from various sources to decision makers could increase confidence in the fairness of resource-allocation decisions and further improve budgeting and planning processes.

2P6, O. While the entities administering each of SIUE's other distinctive objectives gather data on faculty and staff needs to inform unit operations, no processes by which needs assessment data can be used to adjust or refine the objectives of these units is described. Creating clearer processes for using needs assessments to drive change could generate invaluable examples of data-driven decision making, and these examples could be shared to further deepen SIUE's commitment to continuous improvement.

2R1, O. Each other distinctive objective has measures of productivity tailored to its operations, and results are given; however, the results offered appear to be more tied to activity planning rather than goal accomplishment. Data on the number of grants submitted can provide some useful insights; however, tracking how grant applications are tied to goal attainment and how they fit in with overall University objectives might be more useful. Specific outcomes need to be tied to specific goals. For example, the East ST. Louis Charter School High School could be evaluated using such measures as college admissions rates and levels of parent involvement in school programming. NCAA performance could be identified by additional measures ranging from student athlete GPA's, success in recruiting student athletes, and Title IX compliance. University Park (UP) performance could be measured by tracking the number and quality of new partnerships or the success trajectory of former partners following their period of "incubation" at UP.

2R2, O. While SIUE presents data from several sub-populations (the East St. Louis Charter High School, full-time undergraduate students, and athletes), it is unclear to what extent these subpopulations are indicative of the campus as a whole.

2R3, O. SIUE presents data on athletes' academic performance but provides minimal benchmarking data comparing SIUE's distinctive objective's with similar involvements by other schools. Additionally, SIUE may consider benchmarking their data to organizations outside of Higher Education. For example, high tech companies and organizations often have research parks with many of the characteristics and of the University Park SIUE, Inc. that could provide benchmarking.

2R4, S. SIUE's current other distinctive objectives appear to be well suited to advancing the university's goals; nevertheless, more explicit extrapolation of how specific activities within each of these broad areas of commitment advance specific outcomes for the seven long-term goals may reinforce the value of the institution's investments and make clearer to all stakeholders how these endeavors are essential to the University as a whole.

2I1, S. SIUE reports significant improvements within operations for each of its distinctive objectives.

2I2, O. The improvements listed, while laudable, are not linked to any identified gaps, data results, or improvement goals. The statement that "this comprehensive approach will provide a collaborative environment that will generate additional performance results" indicates the early stages of an approach that is not yet fully deployed and not completely a part of the SIUE culture. An opportunity exists to develop a framework by which executive leadership (perhaps in conjunction with other institutions in the Southern Illinois University system) establishes growth, development, and effectiveness targets for each of its other distinctive objectives, for shared objectives, or for the array of objectives overall.

AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs: This category examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification, student and stakeholder requirements, analysis of student and stakeholder needs, relationship building with students and stakeholders, complaint collection, analysis, and resolution, determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems

Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 3.

SIUE intentionally creates comprehensive service and support functions (e.g., the Student Success Center and the Kimmel Leadership Center) with co-located and reciprocally supportive services. Integration of support service processes is advancing as SIUE works to eliminate inconsistencies in collecting and using data to improve services, the generation of longitudinal data, and processes for aggregating data across programs and units for use by the University Quality Council and/or executive leadership. Further, SIUE could mature processes for analyzing and using institution-wide student satisfaction data by analyzing the data at lower levels of accountability and/or setting stretch targets for improving specific results.

Processes for understanding other stakeholders' needs are systematic, but not coordinated or integrated. The University identifies some of these areas as opportunities for improvement and may benefit from a broad campus conversation about who SIUE's key external stakeholders are. Such consensus work may suggest or lead to a framework for monitoring and meeting these stakeholders' needs in a more integrated manner.

3P1a, O. Establishing or clarifying processes by which institutional-level data (e.g., persistence, completion, and graduation data; NSSE and CIRP results) are analyzed and used to identify opportunities and set targets for improvement at the program, department, or school level could prompt academic programs to use a broader array of measures in assessment.

3P1b, O. SIUE may benefit from examining similarities and differences amongst relevant student subgroups. For example, analyses examining reactions of non-traditional aged students, student veterans, international students (from various regions of the world), LGBT students, and transfer students could provide empirical bases for ensuring that curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are welcoming to all segments of the student population.

3P2, O. Although SIUE begins relationship building with students early, and maintains the process through several formal processes, mapping the full array of contact points and opportunities for engagement for key student subgroups (e.g., commuters, non-traditionals, veterans, etc.) could identify if and how some student subgroups could be more effectively engaged or reached if they are not currently engaged.

3P3, O. As indicated in Figure 3.1, SIUE uses multiple advisory boards to inform the institution in matters pertaining to curriculum and student success. It would be helpful to have evidence of how SIUE uses the input from these various boards to strengthen programs and services. SIUE

might also benefit from establishing common elements for the board consultation process; this approach could enable executive leadership to aggregate advisory board guidance.

3P4, S. SIUE recognizes the value of building and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders, as evidenced by examples provided. These initiatives appear to be driven by university representatives; thus, there may be an opportunity for empowering stakeholders to define or refine communication processes.

3P5, O. SIUE could benefit from regular analysis of demographic trends in its existing student population, applicant pool, and in regional high school graduates. These analyses could reveal actual and potential changes in the needs, goals, and preferences of students coming to the University.

3P6, O. Processes for regularly aggregating and analyzing complaint data from all areas and programs would help SIUE proactively identify opportunities for improvement. Current processes may not yield broad insights (i.e., across areas, units, colleges, or divisions) into patterns or trends.

3R1, O. While SIUE uses respected national assessments to gauge student satisfaction and engagement; few data were presented in the portfolio. An opportunity exists for the University to use longitudinal data from these surveys to identify gaps, develop strategies for improvement, and measure progress toward goal attainment. The institution could benefit from presenting a more comprehensive analysis of these survey results to both reviewers and the public.

3R2a, O. Since several years have passed since SIUE University Housing Overall Satisfaction results were higher than Carnegie and National comparisons, opportunities appear to exist to further examine and improve students' housing experience. The University could also benefit from collecting targeted or focused satisfaction data (perhaps via supplemental assessments) on other key aspects of students' campus experience (e.g., dining, recreational facilities and programs, campus life events, access to faculty members). These data could support student recruitment and retention efforts.

3R2b, O. SIUE does not segment results for performance results for student satisfaction making it unclear what the results are for specific metrics. Reporting each of the 15 factors and then trending these data might help SIUE identify gaps and better understanding their student's specific satisfiers. Figure 3.3 indicates overall satisfaction with housing; so by presenting this same type of trending analysis for the other metrics would make understanding the University's

overall performance more meaningful and actionable for University leadership

3R3, O. NSEE and CIRP data suggest that SIUE is on par with peers in key areas, but how these data are used is not clear. With recent initiatives (e.g., SIUE Experience; hiring a director of retention), SIUE's quality agenda could advance by the setting of stretch goals for key CIRP or NSSE results.

3R4, S. SIUE has institutional-level processes for surveying baccalaureate recipients 1, 5, and 9 years out from graduation.

3R5, OO. A systematic approach is needed to gauge stakeholder satisfaction. The portfolio presents limited data and does not provide a context or interpretation for these data. Further advancement of SIUE's quality agenda will involve gathering stakeholder data clearly linked to institutional goals and providing qualitative interpretations of these data to reviewers and SIUE's constituents.

3R6, O. The portfolio cites "extensive uses" of NSSE data to track students' perceptions, but neither results nor specific examples are given. If NSSE data could be analyzed at the program or discipline level, opportunities may open for this data to more directly drive improvements.

3I1, OO. There is no discussion of improvements resulting from data analysis. Further advancement of SIUE's quality agenda will involve setting clear goals for specific processes under this Category, assessing progress toward goals, and sharing both the process and improvements with stakeholders.

3I2, S. The University Quality Council provides a framework within which data can be analyzed and used to guide initiatives throughout the University. The UQC enjoys strong support from the new Chancellor. Continued commitment to this structure by faculty, student, and staff senates promises to increase sustainability of SIUE's quality agenda.

AQIP Category 4: Valuing People: This category explores the institution's commitment to the development of its employees since the efforts of all faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and characteristics; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities; training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and

safety, and well-being; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 4.

SIUI has well developed processes for hiring, orienting, training, evaluating, and rewarding staff and faculty and the long-term strategic goals of achieving a harmonious campus climate and ensuring the commitment of faculty and staff are matched with data-producing measures in its Strategic Plan assessment documentation.

SIUE's employee recognition and reward mechanisms are both systematic and imaginative. SIUE's Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) process appears to be an effective means of monitoring the appropriateness of compensation for internal staff positions. Overall, processes are strong under this category, and opportunities to advance lie in the areas of supporting and developing administrators and coordinating the several units that offer and/or fund faculty development so that optimum use of information, energies, and resources can be achieved.

4P1, O. While SIUE has processes in place to develop the specific credentials and skills for positions for faculty, staff, and administration, an opportunity exists to develop a more comprehensive process that links the needed credentials, skills, values, etc. to the goals of the University. An opportunity may exist to create a common values and skills statement for use with all applicants and in all search and screen processes.

4P2, S.

4P3, S. The in-depth mid-point review of tenure-track faculty members in their third year at SIUE is a strong and exemplary process for supporting employee retention.

4P4, S.

4P5, S. SIUE describes an approach (PDQ and Position Control process) that is systematic in its functioning throughout the organization. This process involves the Chancellor's Council who approves personnel actions which is integrated with the annual strategic planning process and ultimately deployed through the University Planning and Budget Council. The fact that this process is aligned with the SPP and the UPBC indicates that checks and balances are in place to ensure budget control and compliance.

4P6, O. SIUE may have an opportunity to enhance the quality of information it collects on progress in achieving goals 3 and 4 of its seven long-term goals (i.e., goals pertaining to a faculty

and staff commitment and a campus climate that is harmonious). This might involve including questions in the PDQ and faculty member annual review process specific questions about campus climate and/or working conditions. Such input, especially if given in anonymity, could be used in conjunction with the HERI and other data to more effectively monitor progress in this area.

4P7a, S. SIUE has a strong training and support program in place to ensure that faculty, staff, and administrators understand their ethical responsibilities. The program includes mentoring, workshops and other incentives.

4P7b, O. SIUE may have an opportunity to inform student employees and graduate assistants about ethical work performance.

4P8, S.

4P9, S. SIUE has a number of outstanding support services, including the Ombuds Office. To extend growth in this area, the support services listed in the portfolio may supplement the university's annual strategic planning process by emphasizing continuous improvement through closing feedback loops.

4P10, O. The portfolio description of the annual evaluation process for faculty members suggests that the process for and content of performance reviews varies across campus. While complete standardization may not be desirable, the inclusion of some common elements could provide invaluable information on critical areas, such as projected training needs, campus climate, or areas identified via other data (such as the HERI results or the findings of the NSF AVVANCE-IT Catalyst grant) as meriting closer monitoring.

4P11, S.

4P12, O. SIUE utilizes HERI to measure employee motivation and satisfaction. Topics germane to satisfaction and motivation are included in the PDQ process; however, results do not appear to be aggregated in a way that can guide leadership. There could be an opportunity to develop a communications plan that engages all employees in an assessment of campus climate.

4P13, S. Processes at SIUE for ensuring employee health, safety, and wellbeing continue to be strengths of the institution.

4R1, O. SIUE collects a wide variety of data on processes relative to valuing people; however, it is unclear if these data are brought together for study by institutional-level entities, such as the UQC, that could formulate observations and/or recommendations based on the data.

4R2, O. HERI data is collected every four years and may serve as an excellent measure of processes in this category; however, the data given under 4R2 cannot be readily interpreted since the response rate and other contextual information are not given. The data presented for faculty sentiments show that in all areas but one, faculty satisfaction actually declined in 2010 from the 2007 survey. An opportunity exists to examine why this drop occurred and aligning future action plans to the annual strategic planning process.

4R3 SIUE did not provide a response to this question

4R4, O. SIUE's 2010 NSSE results show that a majority of freshmen experience a good campus climate, and these results may be the result of recent positive initiatives, such as the creation of the SIUE Experience, workshops for faculty on working with freshmen, and the hiring of a Director of Retention. Given these developments, there may be an opportunity to set specific university-wide targets for NSSE results and to enhance accountability for these results at the program, school or discipline.

4I1, S.

4I2, O. While SIUE collects institution-wide data pertaining to valuing people (e.g., HERI and NSSE results), the degree to which this data is analyzed and interpreted by key groups, such as the UQC, and whether or not this data is analyzed or filtered for use at the program, discipline, or school level is unclear. Using such data to directly drive change by providing and reporting it at a lower level of accountability may represent SIUE's next, higher level of maturity in its processes for valuing people.

AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating: This category addresses how the institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide planning, decision-making, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction-setting, use of data, analysis of results, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 5.

SIUI has well developed processes for hiring, orienting, training, evaluating, and rewarding staff and faculty and the long-term strategic goals of achieving a harmonious campus climate and ensuring the

commitment of faculty and staff are matched with data-producing measures in its Strategic Plan assessment documentation.

SIUE's employee recognition and reward mechanisms are both systematic and imaginative. SIUE's Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) process appears to be an effective means of monitoring the appropriateness of compensation for internal staff positions. Overall, processes are strong under this category, and opportunities to advance lie in the areas of supporting and developing administrators and coordinating the several units that offer and/or fund faculty development so that optimum use of information, energies, and resources can be achieved.

5P1a, S. SIUE provides evidence of a process for regularly reviewing their mission and institutional values statements. The process is fully developed, fully deployed, and integrated throughout the institution. Further, constituency engagement is significant and broad.

5P1b, O. When operationalizing the seven lessons for reviewing SIUE's mission and values, an opportunity may be created pertaining to Lessons 3 and 4 in the course of creating a broadly representative planning committee and holding constituent conversations. Both venues seem to create occasions for collecting data that could be used in a communications plan or evaluating campus climate and opportunities to 'push' data out to constituents. Further, the institution may want to consider the use of 3rd-party extra-institutional personnel for gathering input.

5P2, S. SIUE describes clear, manageable, and comprehensive processes for strategic planning, including annual goal setting and review to keep links between planning and budgeting current and transparent. At this point, SIUE is poised ensure that all goals are not only measurable but that all measurements are clearly specified, and that data are regularly collected, evaluated, and linked to goal attainment. Improvements can then grow out of the data analysis, and these improvements can be monitored.

5P3, O. Development of a set of concrete examples of how specific budget decisions led to specific high-impact initiatives may heighten constituent awareness of causal links between data, information, planning, and expenditures, and render institutional goals less abstract.

5P4, O. An opportunity exists for SIUE to create a more measurable and integrated system. Such a system could include personal development plans from all administrators that set measurable goals for enhancing student success, responding to opportunities, and keeping abreast of new trends. The University Quality Council and/or the Provost's Senior Staff group may provide representative leadership-level groups suited for analyzing and interpreting data about student

learning (such as the benchmark scores for NSSE results) and setting specific stretch targets for the institution as a whole.

5P5, S. Decision making is a defined and a collaborative process involving individuals at various levels of the institution.

5P6a, S. SIUE has a history of systematically using performance data to inform decision-making processes. There may be an opportunity to further enhance this process by regularly reviewing data collected to ensure that they continue to be the most relevant and meaningful information bearing on specific goals and objectives.

5P6b, O. Opportunities exist to advance SIUE's sophistication in data-driven decision making by segmenting institutional-level data (such as HERI and NSSE results) at lower levels of accountability. The improved and standardized process for deans' and vice chancellors' annual reporting could support this opportunity by including standard requirements for using these data in evaluating progress at the program, discipline, or school level.

5P7, O. An opportunity exists for SIUE to more clearly outline the communication process, and especially to establish measures of communication effectiveness. These measurements can be used to not only evaluate how well ideas flow, but also to encourage the inclusion of all parties. With its history of strong communication across all areas of the University, SIUE has the opportunity to create a model for the assessment of effective communication.

5P8, O. The University Quality Council may be a prime entity to explore metrics associated with high performance organizations and infuse this discovery into the strategic planning process and established communication streams already in use.

5P9, S. SIUE describes a culture dedicated to encouraging leadership and sharing best practices. SIUE may consider moving beyond encouraging faculty and staff to participate in leadership development to requiring annual participation. Requiring and tracking leadership development hours may foster increased awareness and integration of the importance placed on leadership abilities and practices.

5P10, O. An opportunity exists to develop a comprehensive succession planning document. This document could start with an analysis of the status (e.g., including the numbers of faculty, staff, administrators), and projected future needs. Identifying and analyzing potential shortfalls will help the University prepare for future challenges. The document could help pull together the

many current recruitment, training, mentoring, and evaluation systems and ensure that any gaps are filled. It might also help the University focus its resources.

5R1, O. The portfolio describes the process of collecting data on leading and communicating (i.e., the annual reviews performed of leadership), but not the nature of the specific data gathered, whether measures are (or could be) used in common across the University, how data are aggregated and analyzed, or if the data could be fed into other processes (e.g., the developing a communication plan, monitoring campus climate).

5R2a, O. Individual performance evaluations necessarily contain confidential information. However, it is possible to create aggregate data to show trends, areas of relative strength, and the like. Tying evaluation systems to University goals would help show the overall commitment to the goals.

5R2b, O. SIUE has administered the HERI survey for over 20 years; therefore, the Institution could mature its continuous improvement work in this area by articulating how institutional leadership views trends in faculty opinions, and by setting clear stretch targets for further improvement. SIUE has an opportunity to gather feedback regarding staff perceptions of leading and communicating processes and systems.

5R3, S.

5I1, S. The response includes descriptions of several successful improvement projects, all reflecting changes in direction based on thoughtful consideration of both relevant local data and information about best practices. While the improvement projects themselves are primarily focused on issues pertaining to Helping Students Learn and/or Valuing People, their processes are illustrative of principles underlying Category 5. Stronger links between the strategic planning and improvement projects may promote more systematic improvements, and agility in prioritizing projects.

5I2, O. While targets for improvement in this area may be incorporated into the strategic plan, how data are analyzed, distributed, interpreted, and reported at unit levels of accountability (e.g., departments, schools, and the like) is not described. Given the admirable and broad nature of the seven long-term institutional-level goals, ensuring that discrete units can benefit from or respond to initiatives could foster greater commitment to goal achievement.

AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations: This category addresses the variety of institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 6.

SIUE support for institutional operations is integrated, and a strong strategic planning process and an effective University Planning and Budget Committee have guided the institution through the tough economic times despite the Illinois budget crisis.

Further integration of the units and areas providing student support services and administrative support services will entail development of common measures of effectiveness that enable leadership to monitor the full array of services targeted to a particular constituency. The segmentation of satisfaction data by population and/or the analysis of institution-wide satisfaction data at lower levels of accountability may assist leadership in identifying improvements and encouraging greater integration of services and operations.

6P3, O. This is an example of a strength or opportunity for improvement identified by one member of the Systems Appraisal team. The item number (6P3) shows which item in the Systems Portfolio it responds to, and the rating (O here) shows the reviewer considers this to be an opportunity for improvement.

6P1a, S. The developmental framework SIUE employs to map and communicate the interrelations and reciprocal dependencies of the many units, areas, and functions (see listing in Fig. 6.1) that provide support services to students is a powerful tool for understanding how separate functions contribute to achieving Long-Term Goals 1, 2, 3, and 6.

6P1b, O. SIUE describes the fact that key student and administrative support services needs are addressed in the Strategic Planning process. Evidence is not presented about how the institution identifies the support service needs for other key stakeholder groups (e.g., oversight board, alumni, etc.). The University might position itself to better meet the needs of all key stakeholders by broadening the scope by which it views them and their respective needs through the annual strategic planning process.

6P2, O. The portfolio describes a reactive approach to providing administrative support to

faculty and staff. The portfolio does not describe how feedback from service recipients is used systematically to make improvements.

6P3, O. While SIUE has efforts underway to ensure the safety and security of the University, the opportunity exists to tie all these together into a comprehensive safety and security plan that lays out the overall goals in this area, the various services offered, the benchmarks to measure progress, and annual updates on reaching those benchmarks. Those could come from an expansion of the existing security plan or by the creation of a broader safety and security committee.

6P4, O. Support services and support processes are managed and monitored by one of three vice chancellors and evaluated for quality at the unit or area level. The structures of the UPBC and UQC cut across all functional areas and, therefore, may be the source of ideas for how SIUE could inquire into and monitor support that occurs at the interface of two or more areas and can only be improved and maintained at high quality as a result of effective collaboration and intra-area communication regarding both measures and results.

6P5a, S SIUE indicates regular meetings with administrative staff, faculty, and staff combine with the Chancellor's Council, Dean's council, Chairs Meetings, and Unit meetings. These meetings serve as communication tools to for knowledge sharing and empowerment.

6P5b, O. The frequency is of the meetings referenced in 6P5a and how these meetings serve to document processes and support innovation are unclear. There is an opportunity to develop a system for documenting actions and process improvements through such means as an intranet web portal accessible to all stakeholders groups. The Career Services Quality Team (CSQT) is an example of a cross-functional effort to encourage knowledge sharing, innovation, and empowerment that could serve as a model for the institution.

6R1, O. While SIUE collects a variety of measures, an opportunity exists to present this information in a more comprehensive manner that would include an alignment with the strategic objectives, academic learning outcomes as appropriate, the benchmarks for the areas, data collected, and how the information is analyzed and used to facilitate improvements. This could be a simple table that can be modified on a regular basis.

6R2, O. SIUE has done a good job of collecting data on student needs and general student satisfaction. The portfolio does not present any results in terms of the measures identified in 6R1, but instead summarizes recent results from alumni satisfaction surveys, focus groups of students,

and student satisfaction surveys with various aspects of their campus experience. There is an opportunity to detail results based on measures reflected in 6R1 in lieu of the summary results provided.

6R3, O. The economy with which SIUE delivers administrative support services is laudable; however, expenditures are very indirect measures of the quality of administrative support services. SIUE indicates that instructional costs are the only administrative support service process they track and provide results for. It is unclear and worthy of clarifying if the cost figure depicted on page 88 is a singular item or an aggregate of multiple cost items.

6R4, O. The portfolio offers many examples of how support areas and units have used information and results to improve services and describes how an action project resulted in a review process and schedule for student and administrative services review. SIUE might consider moving these aligned processes to an integrated level by introducing standard elements in the review process for related areas or, possibly, across all support areas. The results of common measures could be analyzed by broadly representational or executive-level groups, such as the UQC or council of vice chancellors.

6R5, S. University Housing and Campus Recreation utilize relevant external benchmarking measures to monitor the quality of services.

6I1, O. SIUE has identified the need to create a more holistic approach to improvement processes. One way to do this would be to make sure that improvements or modifications become part of the planning process for all operations – perhaps by developing a comprehensive planning guide that includes problem identification, concrete goal setting, identification of needed data, benchmarks, feedback loops, and improvements seem like a natural next step in SIUE's AQIP journey.

6I2, S. SIUE indicates that its strategic planning process is the mechanism for developing action plans for the institution. Specifically, AQIP action projects and long-term goals are established through this annual process. SIUE is encouraged to continue pursuing initiatives through the annual strategic planning process because this creates a systematic environment for continuous process improvement to flourish. SIUE is encouraged to incorporate the University Quality Council into this annual planning process (if this is not already done) due to the Council's broad and deep reach within the organization.

AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness: This category examines how the institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data both at the institutional and departmental/unit levels. It considers institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 7.

A strategic planning process that establishes and monitors the institution's short and long-term institutional goals illustrates the emphasis the institution places on taking a systems approach to continuous improvement and data-driven decision making. A standing committee exists whose primary responsibility is to monitor the effectiveness of specific processes, and SIUE holds an annual continuous improvement conference to continually drive the culture to performance excellence.

SIUE recognizes an opportunity to expand benchmarking internally and externally in order to anticipate emerging trends and changing obligations. Presenting the actual data on peer comparisons in the portfolio would strengthen SIUE's presentation of evidence.

7P.1, O. How data and performance information are selected, managed, or distributed to support instructional and non-instructional programs and services is not described. SIUE has an opportunity to describe 'how' data is selected for use in understanding institution effectiveness. The institution provides a matrix in figure 7.1 of data sources and their alignment to each of the 7 goals; however, without describing how these data sources are selected the University may be missing the opportunity to fill performance gaps or propel strengths to even higher levels of performance. Data sources for measures of student engagement are not described.

7P2, O. An opportunity exists for SIUE to provide specific information on how data is selected and disseminated. The development of a comprehensive data collection, communication, and analysis plan could accelerate the institutionalization of the University Quality Council (UQC). This group could identify both macro and micro data sources supportive of multiple initiatives and help ensure data consistency, longitudinal analyses, and the segmentation at the unit or area level.

7P3, O. With its recent move to Banner, SIUE is positioned to conduct a comprehensive inquiry

into the data needs of departments and units and to use this information to guide the development of data management and reporting capabilities of Banner. The institution may benefit from including an assessment of unit-level capabilities regarding the access and use of data made available on Sharepoint. The institution provides a chart in figure 7.2 of data supply and demand; however, without describing how these data sources are determined that pertain to various operating units, the University may be missing the opportunity to more completely inform improvement efforts and may not be effectively meeting department needs. For example, the University may consider engaging key stakeholders from operating units as advisory.

7P4, S. SIUE uses multiple means of communicating information to various groups and for various purposes. There is a useful level of redundancy among these communication processes. SIUE processes showing how a strategic plan can organize and drive the ongoing use of institutional-level data are notable. Additionally, the institution has in SharePoint an effective structure to support effective distribution of unit-level data.

7P5, SS. SIUE has a long history of using comparative data (at the state and federal levels) that describe student persistence and academic success, operating efficiency, and student and faculty members' feelings about the campus environment. This history of acting proactively to share, acquire, and develop comparative data pertains to all areas of institutional operations. For example, figure 7.6 provides compelling evidence that benchmarking is taking place. SIUE may consider illuminating how they determine what institutional data needs to be benchmarked and why their selections are important to the institution, particularly in light of the fact SIUE has recognized that public accountability is now front and center in the dialogue of higher education.

7P6, O. Insufficient information is provided to understand the full scope of SIUE's data-analysis processes. Subsequently, it is unclear how SIUE ensures department and unit analysis of data aligns to the mission, vision, and values of the institution. Sharing of institutional data through the Fact Book may be insufficient as a means of ensuring the sharing of analyses. SIUE may consider identifying additional ways of "pushing" data and the interpretation of data to stakeholders.

7P7, S. SIUE has in place a variety of practices and guidelines aimed at ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of its information systems(s) and related processes. These strong processes provide for monitoring the quality of data services and information systems.

7R1, S. SIUE describes excellent structures and six criteria for monitoring the effectiveness of

the processes in its quality agenda; however, no specific measures are cited. SIUE may consider integrating the results of its application of the criteria to the processes in strategic plan updates in order to achieve a systematic approach.

7R2, O. SIUE does not provide evidence regarding the effectiveness of its information management system, trends in effectiveness, or areas of relative strength and weakness. The nature, extent, and results of the feedback generated by the application of the seven criteria are not characterized. Post-Banner implementation might be a good time to conduct a formal review of data needs and the effectiveness of current structures in meeting the needs of key users at the department and unit level. Additionally, through the University Quality Council, key processes and data could be mapped to each of the goals to demonstrate how accomplishment of the mission and goals is achieved. Mapping may support data-driven decisions.

7R3, OO. Figure 7.6 depicts a process presents but no performance data.

7I1, O. SIUE indicates excellence in measuring effectiveness in a comprehensive and systematic fashion; however, an opportunity exists to show actual data, including longitudinal data. It is unclear how the improvements represented in the portfolio are tied to actual data analyses or needs assessments.

7I.2 S. SIUE provides evidence of a strong culture of data collection and use and an ongoing commitment to data collection. The structure of the University Quality Council appears to be an invaluable asset in communicating and advancing the culture of continuous improvement demonstrated by SIUE's reliance on committees and task forces to execute improvement initiatives. For example, the institution identified 7 key performance indicators important to the institution. SIUE may consider establishing key measures and in-process measures to systematically determine their performance on these key indicators.

AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement: This category examines the institution's planning processes and how strategies and action plans are helping to achieve the institution's mission and vision. It examines coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 8.

SIUE has integrated planning processes that encompass unit-level plans as well as an institutional strategic plan, and budgeting. Short and long-term goals are monitored annually using measurable outcomes and clear metrics. These processes are responsive to both external and internal threats and opportunities.

SIUE's experience with AQIP and the solidity of its planning processes may put the institution in a good position to make a landmark contribution to higher education by developing performance measures for planning processes that could be used in peer-institution comparisons.

8P1, S. SIUE has in place comprehensive planning processes that incorporate external and internal influences as well as an alignment with the budget development processes. It is broad-based, inclusive, and clearly related to the University's mission, vision, and goals.

8P2, S. Through its creation of and reliance on the University Quality Council, SIUE has institutionalized the AQIP framework into its daily operations

8P3, S. SIUE links unit-, division-, and institutional-level strategic plans together and aligns with the mission. This ensures that planning is coordinated across and between levels of the institution.

8P4, S. SIUE shows evidence of developing close links between planning and budgeting. This helps ensure that actions plans can be executed in a limited resource environment. Notable evidence of effectiveness in this area is the fact that enrollment and FTE faculty positions have increased over several years of budgetary constraints.

8P5, S. SIUE employs a centralized budget model, while taking a conservative approach to budgeting, and thus it benefits from ongoing external monitoring and reporting requirements.

8P6, S. As noted in 8P1, SIUE has comprehensive planning processes aligned with the budgeting processes.

8P7, S. The University incorporates a variety of risk management practices. This includes risk specific to financial and programs. In addition, SIUE participates in mandated internal and external audits.

8P8, O. An opportunity exists for SIUE to more closely align its employee training and development programs with its long-term and short-term goals. One way to do this would be to start a professional development planning initiative that would ask employees to assess their current status, establish growth goals (which would be tied to the university's goals), timelines

and benchmarks for improvement. This plan could be used to provide more concrete evidence of the university's commitment to continuous improvement.

8R1, S. SIUE has created clear processes for monitoring the effectiveness of its planning processes by using the University Quality Council to review its Strategic Plan and related action plans and by basing Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor annual evaluations on success toward achieving goals generated by the planning processes.

8R2, O. SIUE collects and analyzes a variety of performance data aimed at accomplishing organizational strategies and action plans. An opportunity exists to present the data in way that shows how well the University is doing at achieving goals. The analysis of the data is preliminary, with no real interpretation of what the data means or how it shows progress toward meeting goals. Perhaps focusing in more detail on one or two areas would give the University the opportunity to more closely link the data to actual goals and, in particular, to show progress over time.

8R3, O. The portfolio references institutional targets for four areas: enrollment, retention, graduation, and the development of online/blended learning. The institution seems to recognize the opportunity it now has in initiating a new round of strategic planning to set clear targets for all strategic goals and initiatives. An opportunity exists to go into more detail on how the listed benchmarks were established and how those will help the University achieve its goals.

8R4, S.

8R5, O. While SIUE points to its progress in achieving strategic goals as one legitimate type of evidence for the effectiveness of the planning processes themselves, an opportunity may exist in the course of the new cycle of strategic planning to investigate national best practices for measures of effective planning and to develop an improvement process that is focused on an analysis of the performance of its continuous improvement process. This might be a suitable task for the University Quality Council. As an experienced AQIP institution, SIUE has the necessary data and history to determine if their processes for collecting, reporting and analyzing data are truly effective and how they might be improved. This could also help the University ensure that its resources are used effectively.

8I1, O. Improvements cited in the portfolio were for specific groups and not improvements in the continuous improvement process. An opportunity exists for the University, perhaps through the University Quality Council, to document existing continuous improvement processes, analyze

them, and develop improvement plans. While obtaining both short-term and long-term goals is a good indicator of the overall process, improvements in the actual processes can only come from an analysis of the processes themselves.

8I1, S. The enrollment management plan, the recommendations of the Student Advisory Council, and the eLearning Plan are cited as substantive recent improvements in this area that are comprehensive as they impact the University as a whole.

AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships: This category examines your institution’s relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution’s accomplishing its mission. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville for Category 9.

SIUE tracks results for building collaborative relationships through its long term Goal 5, “Active community Engagement”; therefore, the Strategic Plan is the mechanism that drives integration under this Category. Advancements in this area may be suggested by closely analyzing individual relationships and the array of partnerships as a whole. By developing more comprehensive processes for managing external relationships, SIUE could enhance its characteristic of “agility,” which is one of the qualities of High Performance Organizations under AQIP.

9P1, S. The portfolio offers several specific, strong examples of collaborative external relationships and describes effective structures (e.g., the Dual Admissions Steering Committee) to support broad campus coordination of SIUE’s interactions with external partners. The University might benefit by developing metrics or criteria that provide an objective means for prioritizing resources invested in external initiatives; in addition, having a single SIUE leadership area or unit monitor or coordinate external relations overall may help optimize decisions about where to focus institutional energies.

9P2, O. The Dual Admissions Steering Committee, the Office of Educational Outreach, the Career Development Center, and the Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Regional Economic Development appear to be SIUE’s main points of contact with educational collaborators and employers, and while the latter two appear to prioritize and build relationships independently, all

three might explore opportunities to share information or coordinate on areas of institutional focus. Further, input from regional employers, advisory boards, and/or graduate schools might be better leveraged by creating processes to capture, analyze, and aggregate feedback on the caliber of graduates' preparation.

9P3, S. The portfolio cites many units and service areas that maintain relationships with organizations that serve students, and each unit or area has internal processes for creating, prioritizing, and monitoring these relationships.

9P4, S. Within the constraints of state regulations, SIUE attempts to direct business towards local vendors and businesses owned by women, minorities, and people who have disabilities. Additionally, SIUE describes the extraordinary steps it is taking to preserve the integrity of its vendor base (i.e., paying vendors directly from university funds to compensate for delayed payments by the state).

9P5, O. The portfolio enumerates and describes very strong examples of external relationships and partnerships but does not mention any framework or mechanism for reviewing and prioritizing at the institutional level SIUE's full range of relationships; a high-level review of how and if all external relationships contribute to the university's long-term goals may be beneficial and could perhaps be done as part of the current cycle of strategic planning.

9P6, O. SIUE cites its good relationships with local partners as rationale for not implementing a standard feedback system. Developing such a system may shed light on why the relationships are working so well and how to sustain this success.

9P7, S. SIUE uses the University Quality Council as a vehicle for integrating communication across the University, and broadly representational cross-functional committees further support the flow of information. SIUE may consider publishing through Sharepoint or other internal website a schedule of these meetings and the major outcomes of this effort.

9R1, O. As listed in Fig. 9.1, SIUE collects multiple measures of one-way interactions with the community but does not describe measures for building two-way collaborative relationships.

9R2, O. SIUE identifies in Figure 9.1 Measures of Cooperative and Collaborative Relationships in four major groupings, followed by charts and graphs showing performance trended over time. However, since targets, expectations, and interpretations are not offered, an opportunity may exist to strengthen reporting by including analyses based on targets and reporting the data by all the

individual measures identified in the Figure 9.1.

9R3, S. SIUE has access to and uses benchmarking data from its urban consortium and from public-4-year institutions nationally.

9I1, S. SIUE has developed a service-delivery model that focuses on collaboration, engagement, and regional stewardship. This lays the foundation for a systematic and comprehensive approach for building relationships inside and outside of the University. The careful and thoughtful deployment and integration of this model will be crucial to the quality of institutional intelligence this effort provides to the infrastructure of the school.

9I2, S. The strategic plan and yearly reports of progress toward short-term goals and targets evidently create and reinforce a culture of improvement in this area. Presentation in the portfolio of results analyzed in relation to targets may make the institution's strengths in this area more evident.

ACCREDITATION ISSUES SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, EDWARDSVILLE

The following section identifies any areas in the judgment of the Systems Appraisal Team where the institution either has not provided sufficient evidence that it currently meets the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation* (and the core components therein) or that it may face difficulty in meeting the *Criteria* and core components in the future. Identification of any such deficiencies as part of the Systems Appraisal process affords the institution the opportunity to remedy the problem prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

No accreditation issues noted.

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

(1P1 & 1P2)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has in place a faculty driven, stakeholder-informed process for developing appropriate course, program and general education outcomes that are systematically reviewed, assessed and evaluated with the intention of continuously improving student learning outcomes.

- SIUE has clearly identified student competencies, effectively communicates these competencies to students, the University community and interested stakeholders. The progress toward accomplishing these goals is regularly measured.
- *Could be improved*
 - In its 1P1 and 1P2 responses, SIUE could have confirmed more directly that “the education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.” While General Education encompasses these general attributes, no mention is made of how or if these attributes are incorporated into all academic programs. Assertions that the cocurriculum compliments and supports SIUE’s shared outcomes could be evidenced via a matrix or mapping of activities and outcomes. Lastly, in its 1P1 and 1P2 responses, SIUE does not provide evidence regarding the degree to which faculty members contribute to scholarly and creative work of their disciplines. Cross referencing where this is treated would have been helpful.

4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning. (1P2 and 1P18)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has in place comprehensive and systematic processes for the assessment student learning that include direct and indirect means of assessment. Assessment is ongoing and is a driver for continuous improvement.
- *Could be improved*
 - More explicit evidence of how co-curricular programs are intentionally designed or selected to contribute to shared student learning outcomes and Evidence that co-curricular programs contribute to student learning outcomes would strengthen the accounting for this Core Component.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society. (1P4 and 1P10)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - The University professes a strong commitment to serving its community. Its mission recognizes the need to serve a diverse population and has programs that are attuned to the needs of the community, employers, accrediting entities, and national standards.

- *Could be improved*
 - The *Portfolio* could include a more direct discussion of the Institution's role in a multicultural society.

3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education. (1P4 and 1P12)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - The University's degree programs are regularly assessed and reviewed by the University, the State and, where appropriate, by external program accreditation entities.
 - SIUE designs academic program that reflect the University commitment to mission and vision while continuously working on new delivery platforms such as online and hybrid courses.
- *Could be improved*
 - Documentation that this Core Component is met would be improved by additional evidence showing that the institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortia arrangements, or any other modality).

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs. (1P4 and 1P13)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - Processes for evaluating program quality are discussed at length.
 - The University sets high standards for itself and its students and has committed the resources and energy needed to achieve those standards. Strategies are regularly assessed and modified as needed to ensure quality.
 - SIUE systematically assesses the quality of its academic programs and the quality of education, scholarship and service its programs offer in alignment with its vision. Programs and courses are reviewed for changes or retirement systematically and in clear alignment with faculty governance structures.

2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships. (1P6)

- *Clear and Complete*

- SIUE aspires to transparency in communicating with students and the public regarding programs, costs, faculty, control and accreditations. Key information is made available through the SIUE website, catalogs, and departmental communications.
- The University has clearly published standards and goals. The University Mission and Goals are well developed and continually assessed for relevance. Results of assessment are public and accessible.
- *Could be improved*
 - Detailed information about staffing, expenditures, and the requirements of key selective programs (perhaps presented in a table) could strengthen this response to 2.B.

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching. (1P7 and 1P15)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE demonstrates that it provides a variety of support services for students through the Student Success Center (e.g., student government, disability support services, academic advancement center, instructional services, international student services, career development center, and counseling & health services). Additionally, students are evaluated upon application to determine appropriate academic placement.
 - The University provides a range of faculty training, development, and mentoring opportunities. SIUE monitors support and development services and adds new initiatives as needed.
- *Could be improved*
 - The Portfolio provides extensive descriptions of resources aimed at supporting teaching and learning. Evidence that these support services succeed in improving teaching and learning would improve SIUE's ability to meet 3.D.4. Currently, the Portfolio shows that services are available and frequently used, and that users like them.

2.D The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning. (1P11)

- *Adequate*

- SIUE notes that it has a policy on academic freedom and expresses its support for intellectual freedom in “The Principles of Academic Freedom and Responsibility” and “The Ethics of Instruction.”

2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly. (1P11)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - The University has a clear statement on freedom of expression and academic quality. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that due process is in place for both students and faculty.
 - The University has established clear expectations for academic integrity for both faculty and students. Training and support is available to ensure these standards are met.
- *Could be improved*
 - Description of how the institution ensures the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students and the existence of oversight/support services focused specifically on academic integrity in faculty members’ work would satisfy an institutional response to 2.E.1

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment. (1P16)

- *Could be improved*
 - The University has established clear student outcomes designed to ensure a well-rounded education
 - The Portfolio describes recently established goals for Centers of Excellence in Student Affairs, and refers to several types of data used to formulate these goals. Information about the extent to which the Centers of Excellence have successfully contributed to students’ educational experience in the past is not provided. Inclusion in Category 1 of a table summarizing the data referenced could provide clear evidence for 3.E.1 and 3.E.2.

4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs. (3P1)

- *Clear and complete.*
 - SIUE faculty, staff, and administrators monitor data on progression, retention, and graduation; set goals for improvement; and utilize a developmental framework to

support institutional focus on student success from matriculation to graduation.

Additionally, the University has recently invested additional resources to support these processes.

1.D. The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good. (3P3 & 3P5)

- *Clear and complete.*
 - The common student learning outcomes are designed to ensure that graduates are well prepared to be global citizens able to participate locally, nationally and internationally in an ethical and responsible manner. Other sections of the Portfolio (though not 3P3 and 3P5, particularly) provide accounts of ways in which the University has developed academic and non-academic initiatives in response to regional needs.

3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services. (4P2 & 4P10)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE invests significant time and resources to ensure the proper selection, orientation, training, and evaluation of faculty and staff dedicated to providing effective, high-quality programs and student services. New services, training opportunities and evaluation tools are regularly adopted to meet identified needs.
- *Could be improved*
 - Notwithstanding, information about the numbers of faculty members or staff who support the academic and business operations of the University—perhaps in tabular format—would enhance the presentation of evidence.

2.A The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff. (4P7)

- *Clear and complete*
 - SIUE has well-established standards of ethical and fair practices and policies. These are well-defined for faculty, staff, administration, the governing board, and students. Training, web-based resources, and support are provided to make sure all individuals adhere to standards. Processes are in place to ensure proper redress of grievances.

2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly. (4P7)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has well-established processes to select, train, support, and evaluate faculty, staff, and students. Opportunities exist for faculty and students to discover and apply knowledge, and these opportunities are closely aligned with the University's ethical standards, mission, vision and goals. The University has done a commendable job adding in opportunities for staff to acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

1.A The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations. (5P1 & 5P2)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - Survey results and other data indicate broad support for the institution's mission at levels generally higher than comparable institutions.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning. (5P2 & 5P6)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has well-integrated planning processes (regularly reviewed and updated as needed) that include broad representation.

2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity. (5P2)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE's board has statutory powers granted by the Illinois legislature; the Board is well-integrated into the overall University planning and helps to set the mission and vision of the institution.

1.B. The mission is articulated publicly. (5P3 & 5P8)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - The institution provides ample evidence that its Mission is established, reviewed, and published both internally and externally. Students are exposed to the University goals prior to enrollment, go through an extensive orientation, and complete a senior project to prove they can apply the skills expressed in the University's mission. The public, as well as the University community, are involved in the setting and evaluation of the Universities mission, vision, and goals.

5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission. (5P5 & 5P9)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has collaborative yet structured decision making processes and well established structures to ensure effective communication. Communications flow both directions and opportunities are abundant for faculty, staff, and students to get involved in the planning and operation of the University. Through the Office of Innovation and Effectiveness and University Quality Council, processes and measures are developed and results communicated to key stakeholders.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance. (7P2 & 7P4)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE has in place processes for identifying outcomes and appropriate measures; collecting, evaluating and analyzing data; and using said data to facilitated informed decisions. The portfolio offers several well-documented examples of data-driven initiatives designed to improve performance.

5.A. The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. (8P6)

- *Clear and Complete*
 - SIUE is in a strong financial situation. They have a mature planning process that connects with the budgeting process to help ensure that resources are allocated where needed.

QUALITY OF SYSTEMS PORTFOLIO FOR SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, EDWARDSVILLE

Because it stands as a reflection of the institution, the *Systems Portfolio* should be complete and coherent, and it should provide an open and honest self-analysis on the strengths and challenges facing the organization. In this section, the Systems Appraisal Team provides Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville with constructive feedback on the overall quality of the portfolio, along with suggestions for improvement of future portfolio submissions.

The Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville produced a well written portfolio that exhibited effective use of limited pages to convey information clearly. The Category Introductory statements were evaluative and made reference to the levels of systems maturity the institution perceived in its processes and structures. Clearly, SIUE is a more mature AQIP institution, and this was noted by the review team in the grasp shown in answers of the questions being asked. Where the review team found the portfolio

less helpful was in defining and presenting data. Trend data, if available, would enhance the quality of the evidence greatly. Further, institutional interpretations or valuations of the data will be important to future teams as how SIUE leadership interprets the data relative to its goals is as important to reviewers as the data itself.

USING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

AQIP reminds institutions that the Systems Appraisal process is intended to initiate action for institutional improvement. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of this report may include: How do the team's findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the *Systems Portfolio* to reflect what we have learned? How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP's core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration, and integrity.

AQIP's goal is to help an institution to clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities in ways that will make a difference in institutional performance.