

Reaffirmation of Accreditation Recommendation

for

**Purdue University – Calumet
Hammond, Indiana**

**of the 2007-08
Academic Quality improvement Program
Review Panel on Reaffirmation**

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

November 16, 2007

AQIP Review Panel on Reaffirmation (lead reviewers starred)

Robert Callaway, Director, Institutional Effectiveness & Planning
Lorain County Community College, Elyria, OH

*Christopher Davis, Director of Assessment
Baker College, Flint, MI

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

Charles Guengerich, President
City Colleges of Chicago-Wilbur Wright College, Chicago, IL

Dennis Joslin, President
Nebraska Methodist College of Nursing and Allied Health, Omaha, NE

Adrian Lorbetske, President
Nicolet Area Technical College, Rhineland, WI

Geri Markley, Chair, Quality Management Dept
Cleary University, Wayne, MI

Katy Marre, Professor of English/Former Assoc. VP Grad Studies & Research,
University of Dayton, Dayton, OH

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

Mary Moore, VP for Research, Planning & Int. Partnerships
University of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN

Craig Mosher, Executive assistant to the President
Highland Community College, Highland, KS 660354

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

Diane Nyhammer, Executive Dean of Humanities
McHenry County College, Crystal Lake, IL

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

David Sill, Associate Provost
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL

Susan Stenerson, Dean of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
Lake Superior College, Duluth, MN

William Tammone, Vice President for Academic Services
Montcalm Community College, Sidney, MI

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

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

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

Contents

I. Context and Nature of Visit

A. Review Purpose, Process, and Materials	4
B. Organizational Context.....	5
C. Organizational Scope and Structure (including extended physical or distance education operations)	5
D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment.....	5
E. Compliance With Federal Requirements.....	5
F. Evidence of the Organization’s Responsiveness to Previous Commission Concerns regarding fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation	6

II. Fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity.....	6
Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future.....	8
Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching.....	10
Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge	12
Criterion Five: Engagement and Service.....	14

Summary of team recommendations regarding fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation.....	15
---	-----------

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

A. Comments and counsel on AQIP action projects.....	15
B. Comments and counsel on the AQIP categories	15
C. Comments and counsel on the AQIP principles of high performance organizations and the institution’s quality program or infrastructure.....	16

Summary of team counsel about the organization’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and its participation in AQIP.....	16
---	-----------

I. Context And Nature Of Review

A. Review Purpose, Process, and Materials

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

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

- Current Commission History file of institutional actions
- Current Commission Statement of Affiliation Status
- Current official Commission Organizational Profile
- Annual Updates of year's Action Projects
- Application to join AQIP
- AQIP Review Panel Report(s) on Institutional Status Change Requests
- Focused visit report(s) and action letter(s)
- Institutional websites
- Key correspondence between the institution and the Commission
- Last Comprehensive PEAQ Evaluation team report, institutional response, and Commission action letter
- Quality Checkup report(s)
- Summary of Action Projects attempted
- Summary Update of institutional activity and dynamics since the last Quality Checkup, provided by the institution on September 1 of the review year
- Systems Appraisal Feedback Report(s)
- Systems Portfolio Index(es) (to compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation)
- Systems Portfolio(s), including update provided by the institution on September 1 of the review year
- Any other major reports or documents that are part of the institution's permanent Commission files

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

B. Organizational Context

Purdue University Calumet was first accredited by the Commission in 1969 as an operationally separate Bachelor's degree granting campus of Purdue University. The institution was admitted to AQIP on June 28, 2001. It participated in a Strategy Forum in April 2002. Since admission to AQIP the institution has officially declared and attempted seven individual Action Projects, and has provided AQIP with Annual Updates of ongoing projects and received Annual Update Feedback Reports on these. The institution proposed a change in its relationship with the Commission that was reviewed by an AQIP Review Panel and approved in 2003-04. The institution provided its Systems Portfolio for review during 2004-05, and received a Systems Appraisal Feedback Report on September 27, 2005. The institution participated in a second Strategy Forum in February 2006. AQIP conducted a Quality Checkup visit to the institution on April 11-13, 2007, and provided a report on May 7, 2007 of the findings of the visiting team.

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

Purdue University Calumet is an academically comprehensive regional university and part of the Purdue University system. It is located in Hammond, Indiana less than 25 miles southeast of downtown Chicago, near the shores of Lake Michigan.

The 2006-07 enrollments were 5144 full-time and 3243 part-time undergraduate students, 169 full-time and 747 part-time graduate students and 221 non-credit students. It offers 26 pre-associate degree certificate programs, 20 associate (2+2) degree programs, 92 bachelor degree programs, and 22 masters' degree programs in areas such as engineering, technology, education, nursing, and business management. The University is a 167-acre neighborhood campus, and has an Academic Learning Center in nearby Merrillville, Indiana. The Hammond campus offers apartment-style, private bedroom living for 376 students plus accommodations at a local apartment complex.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

A Quality Checkup site visit to the institution was conducted on April 11-13, 2007. In compliance with Commission requirements, the institution notified its constituencies and the public of this visit, solicited third party comment to be sent directly to the Commission. The Commission shared all comments received with the institution and the team, and the team discussed the comments with the institution and reviewed evidence of the institution's compliance with Commission's notification and third-party comment requirements. [QCU, p. 5]

E. Compliance With Federal Requirements

The Quality Checkup team that conducted the site visit to the institution on April 11-13, 2007 examined evidence provided by the institution of its compliance with the Commission's federal compliance program. The Quality Checkup visit team concluded: "Based on the documentation provided prior to and observations made during the visit, it is the team's judgment that the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. Purdue University Calumet performance in this area is acceptable and complies with Commission and AQIP's expectations." [QCU, p. 5].

The Quality Checkup team also examined evidence provided by the institution pertaining to Title IV compliance and the student complaint information and found the institution in compliance with federal requirements. [QCU, p. 6]

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

The panel considers the response of the institution to previously identified challenges to be adequate.

II. Fulfillment of The Criteria for Accreditation

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

1. Evidence that Core Components are met.

- A. Purdue University Calumet's mission is to offer educational programs of excellence focused on the professional, general educational and lifelong learning needs of Calumet area residents. [SA, p. 11]
- B. The academic mission of the university is to educate students for rewarding careers and empower them for success as productive citizens and lifelong learners. [SP, p. 3]
- C. The University’s vision is:
 - To retain and graduate more students by increasing the freshman retention rate and the six-year baccalaureate graduation rate.
 - To be the preferred university in northwest Indiana's Calumet Region by offering and developing baccalaureate and master's level programs in areas of institutional strength with respect to regional needs.
 - To engage in regional and economic development by increasing the number of faculty and staff who share their expertise, increasing community advisory board membership and building a south Lake County Learning Center. [www.calumet.purdue.edu]
- D. The institution deploys a strategic planning process that aligns its mission, vision, and values. This process resulted in the creation of a Center for Student Achievement, a Technology Center, an Academic Learning Center, and a new scholarship program. [SA, p. 27]
- E. Purdue University Calumet envisions itself as a force for socio-economic progress, civic engagement, and cultural enrichment of the community. The leadership of the university supports an environment conducive to professional growth of both faculty and students. Purdue University Calumet is committed to diversity, multiculturalism, and inclusiveness as sources of strength and enrichment to institutional values. [SP, p. 44]

- F. The ethnic diversity of the campus reflects the cultural richness of the Calumet region, with 68.2 percent Caucasian, 14.7 percent African American, 14.0 percent Latino, and 3.1 percent other ethnic backgrounds. [SP, p. 4]
- G. Seventy-six percent of faculty and staff are white which somewhat under represents the diversity of the region. [SA, p. 12]
- H. Even though the Common Student Learning Objectives do not use the word “diversity,” the common learning goals (5) through (8) were chosen to develop understanding, appreciation, and acceptance of the contributions to the tapestry of human life by all people. The responsibility for insuring that the curriculum prepares students to live in a diverse world rests with departments. [SP, p. 11]
- I. Purdue University is regulated by the State of Indiana, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, and its Board of Trustees. Within that framework, administrative and organizational decisions are delegated to the chancellor by the president. Curriculum decisions have been delegated to the faculty by the Board of Trustees. [SP, p. 7]
- J. Purdue University is governed by the Trustees of Purdue University, a ten-member board appointed by the governor. The board selects the president, establishes major policy, approves budgets, and ratifies all major appointments nominated by the president. In addition to system-wide responsibility, the president is responsible for internal operations at West Lafayette. The chancellor at Purdue University Calumet reports to the president and serves as chief operating officer at the campus. [SP, p. 1]
- K. A key organizational relationship is with the Purdue University system, which provides shared governance and common administrative systems in numerous service areas. [SA, p. 12]
- L. Faculty and staff on all Purdue University campuses participate in governance together and develop mutually beneficial collaborations in a multitude of areas. Purdue University Calumet is represented on the Purdue Faculty Senate, and in the administrative professional organization and the clerical and service organization. [SP, p. 5]
- M. Purdue University Calumet has several leadership groups that share various role sin the governance of the campus. These groups include the University Senate, Senior Leadership Team, Senior Management Team, Academic Administrative Council, Council of Deans and others. [SP, p. 46]
- N. The institution uses a University Forum, whose members act as liaisons between senior leadership and governance groups for discussing major issues affecting the university, to address employee issues. This Forum includes representatives from the administrative and staff council, the clerical and service staff council, and the student government. [SA, p. 24]

O. An academic integrity task force was convened in 2003-04 to address concerns that many students do not understand what constitutes plagiarism, the difference between actively participating in group projects and taking credit for the work of others, and other issues related to academic integrity. The task force recommended to the University Senate that an honor code be instituted and that workshops be developed to train faculty to develop clear guidelines for students in their courses and be able to recognize and appropriately respond to instances when these guidelines are violated. The University Senate has approved the honor code requirement and established a standing committee to implement the code. [SP, p. 15]

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

None

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

None

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

None

Recommendation of the Team

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

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

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

A. The institution deploys a strategic planning process that aligns its mission, vision, and values. This process resulted in the creation of a Center for Student Achievement, a Technology Center, an Academic Learning Center, and a new scholarship program. [SA, p. 27]

- B. In response to the feedback in the Systems Appraisal, Purdue University Calumet has examined its existing processes and has worked to clarify its systems and procedures in measuring institutional effectiveness to ensure that the university is actively preparing for the future. Strategic planning is Purdue University Calumet's chief planning and implementation process. Results of the Strategic Plan are reported yearly to the Purdue Board of Trustees. AQIP projects and reporting have been integrated into the strategic planning process. Three AQIP projects reported progress on the main goals of our Strategic Plan – Student Success (Goal 1), Faculty and Staff Development (Goal 2), and Advisory Board Expansion (Goal 4). As the Purdue system completes the planning cycle (2001-2007), an evaluation of the plan on each campus has been conducted and results of that evaluation was reported the Purdue Board of Trustees. Further review will be conducted as the new strategic planning cycle is started. Additionally, all departmental budget requests must be based on achieving strategic goals. All performance appraisals include a discussion of the employee's connect to department and university-level strategic plans (this process is currently being assessed) Revisions in the academic program review process include steps to align recommendations for academic programs improvements with budget requests linked to strategic planning goals. [Quality Highlights Update, p. 4]
- C. New initiatives are aligned with the institution's strategic plan. Reallocated funds, new student fees, and enhancing fund raising are used to implement the strategic plan. The approach suggests the institution is addressing a key vulnerability in its strategic plan process identified in the systems portfolio. [SA, p. 36]
- D. Purdue University Calumet's Strategic Plan focuses on expanding the institution's role as a partner in Northwest Indiana. One initiative involved expanding advisory councils for academic departments and schools. That expansion is complete. Department heads and deans now need workshops on board recruitment and management to maximize advisory councils' input into issues of curriculum design, internship development, accreditation reports, and fundraising. The start of this project focuses on educating academic department heads in board recruitment and management. These activities help the institution prepare for the future including social and economic trends in the region served by the university. [AP, p. 1]
- E. Purdue Calumet recognizes that some shortcomings existed in the assessment processes within the University, as identified in the systems appraisal. Within the eighteen months preceding the quality check-up visit, the university has developed processes to integrate assessment functions across courses, programs and Schools. Further, PUC began the process of establishing an Office of Assessment including the hiring of an assessment coordinator to, hopefully, be in place by fall 2007. Twenty-four core General Education courses have been identified and are being assessed in a pilot exercise to establish the base for university-wide assessment of general education. Program review is being revitalized and restructured to utilize assessment processes and findings. These steps demonstrate great strides on the part of the university to ensure that ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence to guide continuous quality improvement. [QCU, p. 3]

- F. Human Resources staff conducts environmental scanning annually to determine workforce needs; key regional indicators effecting staffing are identified. As part of the recruiting and hiring process, a set of expectations shared with potential hires. This feedback loop supports the alignment of human resources with the university's mission, vision, and values. [SA, pp. 23-24]

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

None

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

None

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

None

Recommendation of the Team

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

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

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- A. To provide evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness, the Academic Program Review (APR) process has been strengthened. APR provides information that helps the institution document effective teaching and learning by gathering data regarding program objectives, student learning outcomes, evidence of effective teaching and faculty engagement. The requirements of APR complement the regular review of faculty performance in annual reviews and in the promotion and tenure process. Methods of

evaluation of teaching, as endorsed by the University Faculty Senate, include student evaluations, peer review, teaching portfolios and supervisor evaluation. (Quality Highlights Update, p. 2)

- B. The Office of Planning and Institutional Research and the newly-formed Office of Assessment are integrated into one unit in the fall 2007. In addition, a staff member from the School of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences will provide dedicated support to supporting academic departments and the Faculty Senate in student learning assessment. These resources reflect the university's commitment to support assessment of student learning. (Quality Highlights Update, p. 3)
- C. The institution is collecting data regarding number of participants in various programs. Analysis of student needs and satisfaction led to the creation or reorganization of various student services. Results of supplemental instruction and Student Support Services advising and academic intervention substantially increased retention rates. [SA, p. 21]
- D. The institution has recognized the need to provide for the development of its faculty and staff and has taken initial steps to do so with the creation of the Center of Professional Development and other workshops, seminars, and teleconferences. [SA, p. 36]
- E. Recent faculty development results are encouraging including the establishment of the Center for Instructional Excellence and the hiring of an associate vice chancellor for Research and Professional Development. [SA, p. 24]
- F. In addition to PUC 101, all schools have designed freshman seminars whose goals are to help students develop effective study skills, knowledge of career opportunities and a specific plan for success in their field of study. [SA, p. 29]

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

None

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

None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-

up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

None

Recommendation of the Team

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

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

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- A. Purdue University Calumet has identified opportunities and vulnerabilities for its three strategic initiatives: (1) educating undergraduate and graduate students for rewarding careers and productive lives; (2) fostering research to develop academic niche areas; and (3) investing its intellectual capital in regional economic development. [SA, p. 13]
- B. Recent faculty development results are encouraging including the establishment of the Center for Instructional Excellence and the hiring of an associate vice chancellor for Research and Professional Development. [SA, p. 24]
- C. The Office of Distance Education and Extended Learning was created within Academic Affairs in 2004-2005 to support the strategic goal of providing quality education to all qualified students. [SP, p. 11]
- D. At Purdue University Calumet, the faculty holds the authority to set curriculum. The faculty exercises this authority through its governing body, the University Senate. [SP, p. 11]
- E. Academic department faculty determines specific program learning objectives. Accreditation standards in certain disciplines affect these program learning objectives. [SP, p. 11]
- F. The current curriculum development process for new programs/courses includes a process to determine the preparation for enrollment in all courses and programs. Admissions requirements for entry to individual departments are rarely changed. Course prerequisites within curricula are more apt to be changed in response to information gathered in the assessment of learning outcomes. [SP, p. 12]

- G. The strategic plan calls for intensive retention activities to build and sustain a learning environment. The Center for Student Achievement creates a dynamic and self-sustaining set of programs and services that cross the organization. Academic Affairs is instituting this network in partnership with other units on campus. The Center for Instructional Excellence was established to ensure sustained development of faculty and the learning environment. [SP, p. 45]

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

None

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

None

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

None

Recommendation of the Team

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

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

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- A. Purdue University Calumet's mission is to offer educational programs of excellence focused on the professional, general educational and lifelong learning needs of Calumet area residents. [SA, p. 17]
- B. The university has developed key relationships with potential employers, including local governing bodies, businesses, schools, and hospitals. [SA, p. 17]
- C. The university is integrated into the surrounding community. Of the 14 buildings on campus, academic functions are located on the north campus, administrative functions on

the center campus and auxiliary functions on the south campus. There are 3 off-campus buildings of which two will become a research park. [SA, p. 38]

- D. Purdue University Calumet has identified opportunities and vulnerabilities for its three strategic initiatives: (1) educating undergraduate and graduate students for rewarding careers and productive lives; (2) fostering research to develop academic niche areas; and (3) investing its intellectual capital in regional economic development. [SA, p. 26]

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

None

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

None

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

None

Recommendation of the Team

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

<p>Summary of team recommendations regarding fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation</p>

<p>The Criteria are all met, and no Commission follow-up recommended.</p>

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

A. Comments and counsel on specific improvement projects

The record of Action Projects attempted during this period testifies strongly to the institution's desire to improve critical systems and processes. Since 2002, Purdue University Calumet has formally declared seven (7) Action Projects, and has successfully completed and retired three (3) of them. The projects retired include such areas as: improve student success/graduation rates, understanding stakeholder needs, supporting faculty and staff

excellence, and working with advisory councils. The currently active projects include: training for supervisors, creating an academic program review process, and assessing general education.

In 2004, the institution hired a Director for Institutional Research to provide direction for data generation and analysis. [SA, p. 22]

The Systems Appraisal reported in 2005 a lack of evidence of how the institution uses the Strategy Forum, Action Projects, or measures of effectiveness to improve processes. The Quality Checkup visit addressed this issue and reported in 2007 that Purdue University Calumet had adopted the Plan, Do, Check, Act philosophy in all their projects and the institution had built the infrastructure to systematically assess student and stakeholder needs. [SA, p. 7; QCU, p. 4]

B. Comments and counsel on key institutional processes and systems

Evidence from the Quality Checkup Visit Report and the Quality Highlights Update demonstrates a positive trend in systems relating to AQIP Category 1, Helping Students Learn:

- Initiation General Education Review as an action project [QCU p. 3, Quality Highlights Update, p. 1]
- Revisions of the Academic Review Process [QCU, p. 3, Quality Highlights Update, p. 1]
- Creation of an Office of Assessment [QCU, p. 3]
- Development of processes to integrate assessment functions across courses, programs and schools [QCU, p. 3]

With these new initiatives underway, Purdue University Calumet is well underway to establishing a solid foundation for the assessment of student learning. The challenge will be following through on what has been started. The risk is that faculty, administrators, and students will lose energy and commitment, preventing these new systems from producing their intended value.

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

The institution's commitment to building a culture of continuous quality improvement is particularly evident in its achievements related to information and measuring institutional effectiveness:

- Integration of the Office of Planning and Institutional Research with the new Office of Assessment [Quality Highlights Update, p. 3]
- Identification of key institutional effectiveness measures [Quality Highlights Update, p. 3]
- Comparison of benchmark data with other institutions [Quality Highlights Update, p. 3]
- Alignment of measurement and assessment with strategic planning [Quality Highlights Update, p. 4]

Providing greater access to data and information is only a start. The value of these efforts emerges when the information is used for decision-making and planning. The transformation to

a quality culture requires changes in how decisions are made, and that challenge lies ahead.

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

Purdue University Calumet is clearly committed to continuous improvement. The institution has made great strides in the last six years since joining AQIP in completing and retiring three (3) action projects and currently undertaking four (4) more. PUC used the feedback contained in the systems appraisal report to drive their institutional improvement.

The Quality Checkup Visit Report (QCU) of the April 2007 documents that "issues identified by the Systems Appraisal have been addressed in a formal response from the PUC AQIP Steering Committee. Focus teams were developed to address each of the identified issues including accreditation and strategic issues. Specific actions have been identified by most of the teams. This Team believes that these positive action responses clearly show PUC's commitment to the quality improvement process."

The Quality Checkup Team also reported that "Prior to and during the visit the Team observed a high degree of commitment to the integration and ongoing development of Purdue University Calumet's continuous quality improvement program."