1. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT STATEMENT

The National Hispanic University (NHU) is located in the center of the largest concentration of Latinos in Northern California, East San Jose. Founding President B. Roberto Cruz established NHU in 1981 to serve the educational needs of Hispanics, women, other minorities and other learners. It was founded as a response to the dramatic increase in the number of Hispanics in the United States and to their ongoing chronically low college attendance and graduation rates. Following the example that Historically Black Colleges and Universities had set with their high quality education and high retention and graduation rates (ACE, 1980), the NHU was established as a small private independent college whose objective is to successfully graduate Hispanic professionals in education, technology, and business.

Research on college students shows that students enter the university with various individual characteristics that play roles in their academic performance and degree attainment. Family background factors, individual attributes, pre-college experience, socio-economic status, parental educational level, parental expectations, race, and gender are just some of those factors that students bring with them to school and that directly influence their commitment to an institution and to the goal of college graduation (Tinto, 1975). Furthermore, it has been well documented that a multicultural educational environment helps students function more effectively in a pluralistic democratic society. When students learn to create their own interpretations of the past and present, as well as their positions, interests, ideologies, and assumptions, they become critical thinkers who have the knowledge and skills to function in society (Banks, 1996). The NHU recognized, from its inception, that Hispanic students would be more successful in an educational setting that addressed not only Latino students learning needs but that also embraced their social context, language and heritage. Taking all this into account, the NHU was founded on a philosophy of high expectations, academic support, and positive role models in a more intimate, familia-like multicultural educational environment.

Relying on its student centeredness and high quality teaching and learning, the NHU looks forward to becoming the premier Hispanic Institution that addresses the serious under-representation of Hispanics, other minorities, women, and others in higher education, and to sharing effective practices that serve these populations with other higher education institutions. With a predominantly female, Hispanic, adult student population, the NHU is proud to say that it is fulfilling its mission. The NHU expects, however, that it will increasingly attract a diverse range of students across racial and gender lines.
The NHU is looking forward to the WASC accreditation visits. After initial accreditation was granted in 2002, the NHU started its work on the WASC recommendations, anticipating the new visits and new challenges that were to come. In September 2002, the university founder and President Dr. B. Roberto Cruz passed away. However, the university did not slow down. Feeling his powerful legacy and the responsibility of moving forward, the NHU continued with its development. The Board of Trustees renewed their commitment with the NHU and decided to accelerate the construction of the new building, so the university could move into a more stable position, become more visible to the community, and have more space to support higher enrollment figures. At the same time, the university started the development of its five-year strategic plan that derives from three core strategic initiatives: increase and sustain enrollment to enhance financial health, advance university prestige, and promote academic excellence.

Within the strategic plan, all 2002 WASC recommendations are addressed. A stronger, more equal relationship is now being built with San José State University. Some plans were slowed down both by the passing of the NHU’s founder and the resignation of SJSU president. However, the good working relationship between Provosts, vice presidents and other administrators have allowed both institutions to continue working towards a seamless transferring of students from one institution to the other. In terms of quality assurance and educational effectiveness, the NHU has been working on new and improved program review guidelines as well as in student assessment plans for each academic program. Data obtained through these processes will be shared among different constituencies to engage in a continuous cycle of improvement of our academic offerings and student services. Additionally, in order to address the recommendation on financial planning, the university has recently hired a Vice President of Finance who will oversee the university efforts to maintain a sound financial system. Faculty members at the NHU have taken a more central role with a strong faculty senate, an active curriculum committee, and an involved faculty affairs committee. A new faculty evaluation system through portfolios has been established and core full-time faculty members are now eligible to obtain multi-year contracts.

After a national search in the spring of 2003, the Board of Trustees, faculty and staff selected a new President, Dr. David P. Lopez. Under his leadership, the NHU has started a new stage in its development. In August 2004, the NHU moved into its new 65,000 square foot facility that holds modern classrooms, science labs, computer labs, administrative offices and the library. In the summer 2004, the library started a search for a new library director in order to continue with its development. In the past two years, the library continued its expansion by acquiring more volumes, developing an advanced electronic library, and receiving funds from Title V and student fees. In fall 2004 the university will launch a national search for a new Provost. Since February 2004, the university has been working with a part-time, interim Provost. The new Provost will take office in summer 2005 the latest.

The NHU has entered this re-accreditation cycle with the purpose of not only successfully addressing the WASC standards, but also with the intention of demonstrating the progress it has achieved in addressing the recommendations, in implementing its strategic plan, and in establishing systems that will allow it to grow and strengthen its academic offerings. With the participation of faculty, administrators and staff, organized in committees, the NHU community is well informed and committed to make this re-accreditation process a successful self-study and a thorough reflection of its present and future in the higher education arena.
2. DESCRIPTION OF OUTCOMES

In the Initial Accreditation letter from WASC, the NHU was directed to address a list of recommendations by showing “continuing progress and achievement” in these areas. These recommendations have helped the institution to focus its efforts in achieving the following outcomes as a result of the re-accreditation process:

A. Relationship with San José State University (SJSU).
   The NHU recognizes and appreciates the critical support afforded by the successful partnership with SJSU. The NHU has newly appointed a faculty member to head the General Education program and to be responsible of GE articulation and assessment. The development and implementation of the “3 + 2” pre-engineering program as a feeder to SJSU has made important advances. The courses needed in order to offer this program have been already determined and the outlines for each of them have been developed. The courses are currently pending the approval of the NHU Curriculum Committee and once they obtain it, work for articulation with SJSU will start. The NHU has developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the SJSU Air Force ROTC and a MOU with the Army ROTC is under development. Additionally, one of the SJSU full-time faculty members participated as a member of the selection committee for the new Vice President of Finance, and another SJSU representative will participate in the Provost Search Committee. Moreover, SJSU, in its own WASC Proposal of 2002, discussed the importance of their partnership with the NHU. Our university looks forward to strengthening this relationship once a new president for SJSU is selected.

B. Quality Assurance and Educational Effectiveness.
   The NHU is strengthening its evaluation and assessment tools and is making its actions more systematic in achieving quality assurance and educational effectiveness. The key tools the university will use to achieve this goal are its Strategic Plan, the new Program Review process, the new Student Outcome Assessment and Student Services Evaluation plans. Quality and educational effectiveness are at the core of the Strategic Plan. The plan’s implementation is underway and results will be shown during both the Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews. The new guidelines for the program review and the student assessment plans are currently under development, and the Student Services evaluation plan will be developed in the spring of 2005. Each tool will be reviewed and strengthened by the collaborative efforts of faculty and the relevant administrators. Most importantly, the knowledge and insights gained from the results of these tools will be utilized by faculty and the appropriate administrators to engage in better academic program analysis and decision-making. The NHU intends to have improved quality assurance tools and practices that will allow it to more effectively gauge its educational effectiveness.

C. Strategic and Financial Planning.
   In the fall of 2002, the NHU started a seven-month process for the development of its five-year Strategic Plan (see Appendix A.) Under three core strategic initiatives—increase and sustain enrollment, advance university recognition and prestige, and promote academic excellence, the NHU addresses the 2002 WASC recommendations and sets the foundation to continue its growth and consolidation. The implementation of the plan started in the fall of 2003 and the President, program coordinators, administrators and staff have recently reviewed the plan to keep it up-to-date and in accordance with the university’s priorities and needs. By the time of the WASC re-accreditation visits in 2007 and 2008, the NHU will be able to present the results of that implementation and an analysis of the revision processes and results. In addition to the strategic plan, the President has embarked in the revision of the organizational chart to implement some changes. The goal of these changes is to have a more efficient
organization that will support decision-making and planning processes. In order to address financial planning issues, a Vice President of Finance was appointed in the summer of 2004. He is currently developing a plan to ensure a healthy financial system by looking at the budget process, revenue enhancement, and financial and managerial controls (see Appendix B.)

D. Enhancement of the Library Services.

The enhancement of the library has been a critical task; however, significant progress has been achieved (see Appendix C). In addition to receiving Title V funds, the university now assigns $50.00 from the student fees for library support. The library’s website was redesigned to facilitate and increase access to the library’s online resources, which are comparable to private university’s with ten-times NHU’s FTE students. There is an embedded search engine within the NHU library’s website to further enhance student/faculty information access. Academic programs are reviewing their syllabi to make sure that library assignments are included throughout the curriculum and ensure students’ use of the library. Over the course of the summer and early fall, the Provost is heading the search to fill the Library Director position. By the WASC Capacity and Capacity and Preparatory Review visit, the NHU expects to show significant progress in the development of the library and its services.

E. Development of a Core Faculty.

The NHU has been taking steps to fulfill this recommendation. The faculty senate, curriculum committee, and faculty affairs committee have continued their work in the area of academics and have participated in the university’s president search, in the development of a new pay-scale system for adjunct faculty, a new faculty/course evaluation, and a portfolio-based evaluation system to award multi-year contracts to core full-time faculty. Training in the development of portfolios, development of the contract outline, and approval by the Board of Trustees made this a long process. In January 2004, faculty members presented their portfolios to the Interim Provost, and by fall 2004 the university is expected to award faculty their multi-year contracts based on their evaluations. During the review of the WASC standards and the development of the institutional proposal, the committees realized that there are two specific areas that need to be addressed to continue the development of a core faculty: faculty incentives and recruitment practices. A more formal system that defines incentives within specific categories is needed to give faculty the support to excel in their careers. Specific criteria for excellence needs to be developed so that the implementation of incentives will have a standard against which faculty performance can be measured and rewarded. On the other hand, recruitment currently responds to individual departmental needs; however, the hiring procedure requires more consistency in detailing the individual steps to be followed, ensuring faculty input throughout the process. The Academic Affairs division expects to work on these two areas and have policies in place by the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review.

3. CONSTITUENCY INVOLVEMENT

In March 2004, the Office of the Provost, the Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation and one of the core faculty members started working towards the development of the institutional proposal. It was decided at this time that the university would convene a steering committee that would organize and head the re-accreditation efforts. This steering committee is formed by top institutional leaders, faculty and staff and includes the President, the Provost, the Vice President of Administration, the Vice President of Finance, the Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Student Outreach and Support Services, the Registrar, the director of Institutional Planning and Evaluation, the chair of Teacher Education, and a senior faculty member.
In April 2004, the group met for the first time and after reviewing the requirements for the re-accreditation and the institutional proposal development, each committee member was assigned a set of Criteria for Review (CFR) based on their university role to review and determine how the university was fulfilling the core commitments and the standards. In addition, other individuals outside the steering committee were selected by the Provost to address some CFRs because of their experience and work at the university. Each member then convened another small group integrated by faculty and/or staff to work on their assigned standards and CFRs.

The steering committee met once a month to review the work in the sub-committees and to address issues arising in the groups, WASC recommendations, and any other factors influencing the development of the institutional proposal. The sub-committees were asked to meet twice a month if possible to review the standards, understand the re-accreditation process, the accreditation schedule, and to analyze how the university is fulfilling the standards and the core commitments. This effort enabled the participants to not only understand the accreditation process better, but also helped them to understand significant issues that needed to be addressed by their programs.

The work of the steering committee and the sub-committees has been documented in an accreditation portal. Documents, information and minutes for meetings are posted regularly and everyone has access to them so they can keep informed of the process and work done in each committee.

After the institutional proposal is submitted, the work with the sub-committees and steering committee will continue. Each university member and department understands its role in the re-accreditation process and knows the work that needs to be done or concluded. An institutional portfolio will be developed in addition to the accreditation portal to collect and showcase the evidence of the university’s work and accomplishments.

4. APPROACH FOR CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

For the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the NHU will have available institutional data in a clear and user-friendly format, exhibits of how the WASC recommendations related to capacity have been addressed, and exhibits of clear processes and procedures.

Currently, the NHU is collecting institutional data related to student body characteristics, enrollment, retention, degrees granted, new student data, FTE, average units taken, GPA, grade distribution, and faculty data. This information is being compiled into a fact book that will be available both in printed and electronic forms. The electronic form will be accessible through the Electronic Institutional Portfolio that will be developed and available for the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit. Additional information that will be included in the electronic portfolio is detailed data on faculty and staff, detailed and clear information on fiscal, physical and information resources, and a list of current assessment activities.

An important focus for the Capacity and Preparatory Review will be exhibits of how the NHU has been addressing WASC recommendations related to capacity. A clear financial plan will be presented, as well as the appropriate data linked to the plan development and its results. In 2003, NHU developed its five-year strategic plan. For the capacity and preparatory review visit, the plan will be available for revision, as well as the implementation plans, indicators and an analysis of what has been
accomplished, what challenges have been encountered and what has been done to overcome them. Information and data related to the enhancement of the library services will also be presented.

As a third element for the preparatory visit, the NHU will show evidence of clear processes and procedures. The general catalog, student, faculty and staff handbooks have been reviewed and updated in 2003 and 2004, and the new versions will be available. The new program review guidelines will be published and in place, as well as the student outcome assessment plans. The Student Services evaluation plan will be available for review, and the results, analysis and actions taken will be well documented and accessible through the institutional portfolio. Additionally, the process to award multi-year contracts to faculty will be available for review and evidence of the faculty’s role in the university governance will be presented.

Finally, the NHU will discuss its planning and organization of the Educational Effectiveness review and the advances and evidence collected that show the work and results done to address the areas of student assessment, educational quality, program review, students’ work, and faculty evaluations.

5. APPROACH FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The Educational Effectiveness (EE) Review will be conducted under the Comprehensive Approach suggested in the WASC Accreditation Handbook for universities that want to review how it supports student learning and the effectiveness of its overall quality assurance system. Through this approach, the NHU expects to better develop and refine the procedures it has in place to assess student learning, evaluate program effectiveness, and ensure quality throughout its academic practices.

Since the last WASC visit, the NHU has been focusing on the evaluation of educational effectiveness. For the (EE) review, the university will show progress in the following areas:

A. Evaluation of program effectiveness.

All academic programs have undergone a program review in the last two years. Liberal Studies and Teacher Education had to revamp their curriculum in order to comply with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) new standards as a result of the Senate Bill 2042. Computer Science made significant changes in order to offer a more up-to-date program. As a result of a program review in 2003, Business Administration also made some changes to its program and restructured its course sequence to have a stronger program. Program coordinators will provide documentation on the program changes and the rationale behind them, and where available, evaluation of those program changes will be done and reported. After having these program reviews, it was determined that there was a need to develop new program evaluation guidelines in order to have a consensus on the process, goals, expected outcomes, and reporting format. The NHU plans to have these new guidelines in place and the program review schedule ready in Summer 2005 to start implementation.

In addition to program reviews, the NHU also plans on obtaining feedback from its alumni to learn about its program effectiveness. Alumni who graduated since 2000 will be targeted and their opinions about the academic programs, services and the NHU experience will be obtained. This information will then be shared with university stakeholders and used as part of the quality assurance system to ensure quality in academic and student services.
B. Student learning assessment plans.

Academic programs have been assessing their students’ learning using tools such as student portfolios, testing, presentations, projects, writing proficiency tests, and capstone courses. However, in an effort to have a more systematic and formal approach to student assessment, all academic programs started working on the development of their student assessment plans. Based on their program goals and objectives, each department is developing an assessment plan. The plans will be ready for review and fine-tuning in Fall 2004 and their implementation will start in Spring 2005. For the EE review, each academic department will have its plan ready and in place, and evidence of their implementation and results will be available for review.

C. Evaluation of the Student Academic Assistance Center (SAAC).

The SAAC provides academic support for students in math, English and other areas. Previous evaluations centered on number of students served and student satisfaction with the services. A goal for future evaluations is to find out how students and faculty perceive the services—effectiveness of tutoring, impact on students’ academic achievement—and to obtain feedback on services needed. The Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation, the Academic Planning Council and the SAAC will work in tandem to develop an evaluation form to collect this information by Summer 2005. By the EE review visit, NHU will have results of this evaluation and implemented changes or improvements.

E. Student services evaluation plan.

The office of Student Outreach and Support Services (SOSS) has started to engage in a self-analysis of its services, goals and needs. An immediate goal for this office is to evaluate the support services it currently offers and analyze their impact on student retention, persistence and academic performance. The information obtained through this evaluation will be used for future planning and needs assessment. In addition, SOSS plans to use this information to formalize and institutionalize a plan for the further development and establishment of student life and extracurricular activities that in turn will enhance students’ college experience, both academically and socially. By the EE review, the results of this evaluation, analysis, and plans will be presented.

D. Overall quality assurance system.

Program reviews, assessment, and evaluation of student services are currently used to address Educational Effectiveness. New faculty/course evaluations were recently developed and are now implemented electronically. The users of this information will be able to determine how well the process is going and what needs to be changed to make it better. The Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation will be a collection center for this information and will be in charge of disseminating feedback on the processes to those who are collecting the information. The users of this information will be the evaluators of this system and will provide feedback on how well the information is collected, how useful it is, and what changes they find necessary.

The academic programs have well-defined goals and objectives, curriculum scope and sequence, and have been utilizing new approaches to teaching such as WebCT. Faculty members have attended diverse conferences that give them the tools to teach better and understand and address their student needs. With the development of program review guidelines and assessment plans, academic programs will be strengthened by a quality assurance loop that will provide them with useful information in a timely manner.
6. WORKPLAN AND MILESTONES

Taking into account the expected outcomes and the approach to both the Preparatory and the Educational Effectiveness Reviews, the following work-plan will be followed:

**Outcome:** STRATEGIC PLANNING

**Work-plan:**
- The five-year strategic plan was developed in 2003. Currently, the implementation of the plan is taking place. The first revision to the plan will take place in Fall 2004 and a yearly revision plan will be set.
- Update and reviews of the implementation plans will be done twice a year. Information of results and problems encountered will be shared with all university stakeholders to ensure a continuous implementation of the plan.
- All information related to the strategic plan and its implementation will be posted in the electronic institutional portfolio for easy access by WASC and other stakeholders.

**Responsible:** The Office of the Provost oversees the process and reports to the President’s Cabinet. Academic departments, student services, and administrative departments are responsible for their implementation plans. The Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation (OIPE) is in charge of collecting information about the implementation plans and posting information in the institutional portfolio.

**Indicator**
Implementation plans are being followed and data about it is collected, analyzed and shared among university stakeholders. The lifespan of the current strategic plan is 5 years. By the EE review, the implementation of the plan should be in its final stages and work towards the development of a new strategic plan should be underway.

**Outcome:** FINANCIAL PLANNING

**Work-plan:**
- New financial plan will be developed by Fall 2004 looking specifically at budget process, revenue enhancement, financial and managerial controls, and student recruitment and retention.
- Implementation of financial plan will be done immediately and available for review during Capacity and Preparatory Review.
- Analysis of financial plan implementation and continuous update will start Spring 2005

**Responsible:** Vice President of Finance and the President.

**Indicator**
Financial plan will be ready for immediate implementation, will be explained and known to all university stakeholders, and a monitoring and analysis system will be in place to assess the plan's functionality and effectiveness.
Outcome: QUALITY ASSURANCE

Work-plan: - The results and analysis from the program reviews, student assessment, evaluation of student services, and course/faculty evaluations will be shared among the different academic departments, as well as with administrative departments, student services areas and other groups such as the Academic Planning Council, President’s Cabinet and Board of Trustees. These areas in turn will be able to set a data-driven decision-making process that will result in better planning and understanding of the university’s work.

- The feedback system created will allow the various departments producing the information to ascertain whether there are any modifications necessary to the kinds of data that they need for their analysis.

- The quality assurance system will be formalized by Summer 2005 and ready to be used in Fall 2005.

Responsible: The Office of the Provost oversees the quality assurance system. Academic departments, OIPE, and student services will be in charge of collecting, analyzing and disseminating information. The groups and departments using the information will be asked to provide input and feedback on the quality of the data collection process. Through a collaborative and consultative data collection, dissemination, and analysis process, the quality assurance system will become more efficient.

Indicator: Information will be available for everyone’s review and use, and a feedback system will be implemented by Fall 2005.

Outcome: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Work-plan: - New program review guidelines will be developed in Fall 2004 and ready for implementation by Summer 2005. A new schedule for program reviews will be established by the Academic Planning Council and approved by the Faculty Senate. Programs that underwent program reviews in the past two years will have an analysis of the reviews, changes implemented and up-to-date results from those changes.

- Student outcome assessment plans for each academic program will be set by Fall 2004 and ready to be implemented by Spring 2005. For the Capacity and Preparatory review, the plans will be available for assessment and for the EE review, results, and an analysis will be available for discussion.

- A new evaluation instrument for the Student Academic Assistance Center will be developed in Summer 2005 to learn more about the center effectiveness and the impact on students’ academic performance. The instrument will be ready to be used in Fall 2005 and analysis and result will be published in Spring 2006.

Responsible: Academic program coordinators, the Provost, the Student Services office and the Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation will be in charge of developing the guidelines and instruments, of collecting data, analyzing it and distributing it to stakeholders in the university.

Indicator: Program review guidelines, student assessment plans and evaluation instruments will be developed and used before the Preparatory visit and ready to show results by the EE review.
Outcome: **STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION**

Work-plan: - The office of Student Outreach and Support Services will start developing an assessment plan that focuses on existing support services such as tutoring, advising, use of computer facilities and the library, and that evaluates the need for other services to enhance student life on campus.

- The assessment plan will also focus on the link between student services and student academic performance and student retention and persistence, as well as, on the need to formalize and institutionalize student life activities, student associations, and extracurricular activities.

Responsible: Director of Student Outreach and Support Services.

Indicator - A clear assessment plan will be developed and disseminated by Summer 2005 and ready to be implemented by Fall 2005.

- For the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the plan and its implementation specifications will be available for review.

- For the Educational Effectiveness Review, results of the assessment, analysis and decisions made will be available for discussion and review.

Outcome: **RELATIONSHIP WITH SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Work-plan: - The General Education program coordinator is working with SJSU to re-certify the 13 general education courses currently articulated and to articulate 16 more general education courses. The 13 currently articulated courses will be re-certified by the beginning of the Spring 2005 semester, and the additional 16 courses will be articulated by summer 2005.

- The “3+2” pre-engineering program will continue its development and start articulation process with SJSU in Spring 2005.

- The new library director will re-establish relationship with SJSU library and gain more access for NHU students.

Responsible: The General Education program coordinator, the Provost, and the library director will head these efforts.

Indicator - 13 general education courses will be re-articulated plus 16 courses will be added to achieve a seamless transition for the NHU students to SJSU.

- “3+2” pre-engineering program will obtain articulation with SJSU and program will start enrolling students by Fall 2005.

- NHU students will have better access to SJSU library and resources.

Outcome: **DEVELOPMENT OF CORE FACULTY**

Work-plan: - Multi-year contracts will be awarded to faculty members in Fall 2004.

- Faculty evaluation and portfolio systems will be evaluated to determine usefulness and effectiveness in this process.

- Hiring policies and schedule will be discussed in Summer 2005 and developed by Fall 2005.

- Activities of the Faculty Senate, curriculum committee and faculty affairs committee will continue to be documented and will be accessible through the institutional portfolio by Spring 2006.
Responsible: Provost and faculty groups.
Indicator Current full-time faculty will have multi-year contracts by Fall 2004. Clear documentation of process will be available and its effectiveness evaluated by Spring 2006.

Outcome: **ENHANCEMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES**

Work-plan:
- By Fall 2004, the library will have a new director.
- New director will continue addressing the WASC recommendation of strengthening the role of the library in the academic programs.
- Library director will work in tandem with academic program coordinators to continue up-dating library holdings and provide support for new academic initiatives such as the 3+2 Pre-engineering program, the new Single Subject Teaching Credential and post-graduate initiatives.

Responsible: Library director and the Provost
Indicator
- The number of library volumes will increase and come closer to WASC specifications.
- Library holdings to support pre-engineering program and other post-graduate initiatives will be available.
- A plan for the continuous development of the library will be available.

Outcome: **ELECTRONIC INSTITUTIONAL PORTFOLIO**

Work-plan:
- Design of the portfolio’s structure will be done in Spring 2005 and implementation will start in Summer 2005. Maintenance and constant update will start once the structure is set. Although most data to be included for capacity and preparatory review is already being collected, the information needs to be concentrated in this new repository.
- The evidence and data necessary for the Capacity and Preparatory Review will be ready by Fall 2006. For the EE Review, data and evidence will be ready by Fall 2007.

Responsible: The Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation (OIPE) will be in charge of collecting data and information and of maintaining the institutional portfolio. Academic departments, Finance, the Registrar, and Student Services will provide information as well.
Indicator Electronic institutional portfolio is accessible to academic, administrative and other entities in the university, and contains up-to-date information on institutional data, evaluation, assessment, finance, processes and procedures, general catalog and manuals, and student services.
7. EFFECTIVENESS OF DATA GATHERING AND ANALYSIS SYSTEMS

Most of the required data for the Capacity and Preparatory Review are already collected and have been formatted in a clear, user-friendly format in the NHU’s fact book. Enrollment, graduation rates, retention, student characteristics, and faculty characteristics will be ready for review both in print and electronic format. Additionally, assessment data, placement, and program evaluation results will also be integrated in the institutional portfolio and available for review.

The information currently collected is shared among members of the Academic Planning Council, President’s Cabinet, Board of Trustees and other interested parties within the university. These bodies use this information to have a more efficient decision-making process. As the university continues growing, new needs for data have been determined and the various departments—finance, planning and evaluation, the registrar, and financial aid—share their data and analysis with decision-making bodies. [See Appendix E for a description of committees and groups.]

The users of the data also provide input to those areas generating them in an effort to make this system more efficient and useful. [See Appendix D for a list of data currently available.]

8. PROPOSAL DATA TABLES

The prescribed set of Data Exhibits for the Proposal can be found with the accompanying documentation.
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