



## QUALITY PROGRAM SUMMARY October 2011

Given the page limitations for this document, the University of Saint Mary's Quality Program Summary will focus on major activities/accomplishments since submission of USM's AQIP Portfolio in November 2008. Most of the items included will be in response to the Portfolio Assessment, which provided useful direction for our continuous quality improvement. Some have resulted from our own self-assessments.

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Before reviewing program improvements made since the fall of 2008, it might be useful for HLC to review the following documents, all of which are available at: <http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/default.htm>

**USM's AQIP Systems Portfolio (November 1, 2008):** This was USM's first Systems Portfolio, and we believe it provided a useful base for our continued improvements to date.

**System's Appraisal Feedback (February 16, 2009):** We were pleased to read the summary opinion: "The Systems Appraisal team concluded that the University of Saint Mary has presented evidence that it complies with each of the Five Criteria for Accreditation and each of their Core Components," as we were with the many positive comments that the team offered in response to the nine categories. But even more importantly, we paid close attention to those areas which the team identified as providing opportunities for improvement and resolved to address those going forward.

You will also find at the above link a complete listing of **USM's Action Projects**. Once again, for some historical perspective, I would direct you to Action Project Numbers 1 – 3 and 5, 7 and 8, all of which have been "retired" but that should be read in conjunction with our Systems Portfolio. They reflect our earliest efforts at meeting the goals of HLC's AQIP Accreditation "Path."

**Action Projects #1 & #5:** Our goal for these two projects was to "identify, evaluate, and prioritize reports and processes for informed, data-based decision-making." Project #1 established the basis for that process. Project #5 was added with an eye toward establishing leading indicators, aligning assessment tools, and describing procedures for measuring institutional effectiveness. Although still a work-in-progress, we have been successful in moving toward a closed loop system for ongoing improvement university-wide that is accessible and integrated. More on this below.

**Action Project #2:** Our goal was to expand USM's Capacity to Provide Distance Learning. At the time we offered one online academic program, a Masters of Arts in Teaching. Since then we have added a Registered Nurse to Bachelors of Science in Nursing degree completion program and a Masters in Business Administration – which are accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education and the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education, as well as HLC.

**Action Project #3:** This university-wide project was aimed at developing "a comprehensive strategic plan with a clear vision," that would "integrate our mission with new strategies and action plans resulting in a clearly defined and innovative institutional vision for the next five years." We were successful in creating such a Strategic Plan with a healthcare focus. More on this below.

**Action Project #7:** The goal of Project #7 was to develop a university-wide client service plan, which would improve delivery of client service to our internal and external audiences through systemic processes and measurable outcomes. The expectation was that such a plan would further the university's mission by challenging our employees to reach their professional potential by providing exceptional service. A plan was developed, which included training front-line staff and a process for regular service assessment. More on this below.

**Action Project #8:** Project # 8 was intended to “enhance academic advising for greater student success.” More specifically, the goals were to design a system for advising and mentoring that would enhance student learning and retention; ensure that all new students (including transfers), are immediately linked with a team of well-trained faculty and student services advisors for optimum academic and career advising; support all students in investigating academic and career options; and assure strong mentoring relationships for all students throughout their course of study. The committee charged with leading this initiative produced a detailed report with over twenty recommendations, most of which have been implemented with only a few still in process.

Also of interest to the reviewers in the way of background may be the AQIP Innovation Report, also found at the link noted above. That section actually consists of three reports of which we are especially proud because they attracted considerable praise by the HLC.

***Innovative Practice: Ongoing Improvement Models #1 & 2***

The OnGoing Improvement (OGI) model directs strategic and systematic planning and improvement, consistent with AQIP Categories VII & VIII. The OnGoing Improvement model is used by all university departments, linking strategic initiatives and annual goals to mission, research, collaborations, actions, evaluation, and improvement. The OGI process utilizes a data-based, collaborative decision making approach and has been very effective.

***Innovative Practice: Service Learning***

As a distinctive objective (AQIP Category II) service learning has strengthened commitment to mission; enhanced curriculum; benefited teaching and learning, curriculum, course design and teaching styles; and improved community relations.

***CHEA Award***

And finally, we would call to your attention that in December 2006, CHEA awarded USM's Master of Arts in Education and Masters of Arts in Teaching programs its 2007 Council for Higher Education Accreditation Award for Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes. As the award reads: “The Award is given to education programs that demonstrate outstanding achievement in promoting student success, based on overall learning outcomes.” USM was one of five institutions picked from a national pool to receive this honor, based on four criteria: articulation and evidence of outcomes; success with regard to outcomes; information to the public about outcomes; and using outcomes for improvement.

## **KEY DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2008**

One of the most important developments since 2008 has been the creation and implementation of a new and exciting strategic plan, which can be found at: <http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/StrategicPlan-2011.pdf>

As the University of Saint Mary neared completion of the strategic plan adopted in 2006, a new strategic planning process was undertaken. In the fall of 2010 a Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) was formed, with representatives from each internal stakeholder group, to begin development of a new strategic plan.

The entire university community, including the Board of Trustees, participated in the SWOT analysis exercise to help identify the current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of USM. The SPC created to guide the process included three trustees: the SCL community director, the university president, and the chair of the Board of Trustees; five faculty; the Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services, the Vice President for Marketing and Communications, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of Athletics, and the Director of Enrollment Management.

The resulting plan is built upon the three critical issues:

1. Health Science
2. Low Retention and Graduation Rates or Academic Success
3. Facilities need for expansion and upgrades and closing a technology gap

To address the strategic issue “*health sciences*”:

USM will develop programs in health care, as a niche for which the university will be recognized. Further, it will build on the unique relationship USM has with the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth (SCL). USM is founded and sponsored by the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth, and the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth Health Care System (SCLHS) is the health care arm of that ministry. It has thirteen care sites (hospitals) and four clinics stretching from Kansas City, Kansas to the Los Angeles, California areas. USM and SCLHS work to identify and create synergy between these two ministries. We look forward to growing this partnership with the implementation of our Doctorate in Physical Therapy Program, our expanded nursing programs, and our degree in Healthcare Information Management, all part of our Strategic Plan and noted below.

To address the second strategic issue, “*USM is challenged by low retention and low graduation rates*”:

USM will improve its retention and graduation rates by improving academic success, enhancing students’ sense of belonging and building a stronger student community, and improving student-athlete success by promoting a positive culture for discipline and learning.

And to address the third strategic issue, “*USM facilities need expansion and upgrades and the technology gap is impeding the university’s ability to educate, recruit, and retain today’s students*”:

USM will improve and enhance facilities and technology to meet the university’s need to expand and to upgrade our infrastructure to prepare for future campus growth contributing towards successful student recruitment and retention.

### ***Doctor of Physical Therapy***

One of the most exciting new programs will be our first doctoral program – a Doctorate in Physical Therapy. First identified in the university’s 2005 Strategic Plan as consistent with its goal of enhancing its health science offerings, creation of a DPT program was made into an Action Project in 2006 (See AQIP Action Project #4: [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/action\\_projects\\_04.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/action_projects_04.htm))

On August 19, 2011, the Higher Learning Commission notified USM of its approval. (Read the commission’s letter online at: [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/DPT\\_HLC\\_approval\\_letter.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/DPT_HLC_approval_letter.pdf))

The next step is to seek candidacy status from the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy, the application for which will be submitted in November 2011. We expect a site visit in January 2012, approval by April, and admission of our first class in June.

Related to implementation of USM's DPT program is a major renovation of one of USM's historic buildings (already begun), which will house the university's health science programs, including DPT and Nursing programs -- BSN, Accelerated BSN, and MSN (proposed).

### ***Accelerated Nursing Program***

To further enhance its focus on healthcare, USM intends to add an Accelerated Nursing Program, which will expand our highly successful BSN program. The Accelerated BSN is a new model of delivery designed for second degree students. Read the Accelerated Nursing Program governance proposal and curriculum online at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Accelerated\\_Nursing\\_Proposal\\_for\\_Faculty\\_Governance.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Accelerated_Nursing_Proposal_for_Faculty_Governance.pdf).

Students who have met all prerequisites before they are admitted can complete their BSN degree in 12 months. Our feasibility study/business plan shows that there is a need for such a program in the Kansas City area, and that USM has the capacity to add it to our Nursing Program. Read the feasibility study at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Accelerated\\_BSN\\_feasibility\\_study.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Accelerated_BSN_feasibility_study.pdf).

As is warranted in each case, USM will seek approval from, or formally notify, HLC, the Kansas State Board of Nursing, and CCNE before admitting students to the program, which we expect do in June 2012.

### ***Healthcare Information Management***

Scheduled to begin in the fall of 2012 is a new Bachelors of Science Degree in Healthcare Information Management (HIM). The HIM business plan can be found online at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Healthcare\\_Information\\_Management\\_Business\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Healthcare_Information_Management_Business_Plan.pdf).

HIM will be an integral part of our focus on healthcare, and our feasibility study shows the need is significant. As President Obama has made clear, the future lies in electronic healthcare records and the nation's healthcare facilities are not yet positioned for this change in doing business. Further, USM is located within a short drive of the Cerner Corporation, whose specialty is healthcare records management, and this past year the United States Department of Veterans Affairs has opened the Central Plans Consolidated Patient Account Center, which plans to employ over 400 records management personnel. CPAC is literally across the street from the University, and we have already begun conversations with the training manager at CPAC to form a collaborative training/education program.

### ***Masters of Science in Nursing***

We are also planning to add an online MSN. Our Business Plan concluded that there is a need for such a program, and that building on our already strong undergraduate Nursing Programs, USM has the capacity to offer it. Our plan is to complete all internal governance and external accreditation approvals in time to enroll our first class in the fall of 2013. Find the MSN business plan online at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/msn\\_proposal.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/msn_proposal.pdf).

## **OTHER FOCUS AREAS**

### ***Assessment***

A major area of concern in USM's Systems Appraisal was Assessment. This did not surprise us, as we readily admitted that the internal system we had developed was not yielding useful information, and that we had no consistent external measure of student learning. As a result, we made that our focus for our HLC post-portfolio workshop in Lisle. The workshop was very useful, and we returned to campus with two guiding principles for revising what we had done.

First, with the input of HLC workshop leaders and colleagues from other institutions, we concluded that our internal measures were too complicated to produce the information we needed, and that the solution was not necessarily to “start from scratch,” but rather to simplify what we had created. We returned this directive to the faculty, which reassessed its University Learning Objectives and reduced the total number from 7 to 4. This is what they arrived at:

The student will:

1. Demonstrate ability to investigate and assess information to develop knowledge.
2. Demonstrate ability to use, integrate, analyze, and interpret complex information and connect theory and practice to draw new and perceptive conclusions.
3. Demonstrate the ability to evaluate information from disparate sources, to transform information into meaningful knowledge to solve or accept complex issues.
4. Demonstrate ability to use English language conventions accurately to construct coherent written and oral arguments.

That was accomplished in April 2011, which set the stage this fall (2011) for creating a matrix of key courses essential to the realization of those University Learning Objectives and revised rubrics as to how the ULOs will be measured, scored in each course, and reported. This should be completed by December. The related data points and ULOs are online at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Data\\_Points\\_by\\_ULO\\_Sept\\_2011.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Data_Points_by_ULO_Sept_2011.pdf).

The Assessment Committee also addressed the issue of finding external measures which would provide us with the information we need to validate our internal assessments. That was accomplished as well with the identification of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE). We implemented the CLA in the Fall of 2011 with its administration to 100 freshmen students, the results of which are expected in February. In the spring of 2012, we will administer the second part of the CLA to seniors, which should provide us with the data we need to validate or adjust our internal measures and pedagogy.

Further, we chose to implement an indirect measure of student learning, which will also provide an even broader gauge of student learning and success, namely NSSE. NSSE is a self-reporting survey of student engagement in many different forms that is widely used throughout the United States. We will administer NSSE for the first time to freshmen and seniors in the spring of 2012.

We plan to “close the loop,” or provide feedback of the data we gather from these three measures to the faculty so that they can adjust the curriculum and their instruction, as appropriate. Thus it is our plan for the early fall, when we will have the results of the implementation of our three learning assessments, to initiate an annual “Student Learning Assessment day,” during which all data gathered from the previous year will be presented to the faculty and appropriate, directed workshops at the faculty, departmental, and program levels held throughout the day to analyze the data, and determine what changes need to be made.

### ***Student Success***

Another key area of concern for USM over the past three years has been student success as measured by retention and graduation rates. As noted in both our 2008 Portfolio and our new Strategic Plan, we believe we can and should do better in all of these categories. In our 2008 Portfolio we reported that the Kansas Independent Colleges Association’s (our peer group of colleges) average retention rate for first time, first year students (Fall to Fall, First to Second Year) was 66%. USM’s retention rate over five years averaged 61% (given our small student population and comparatively large fluctuations, we find it more accurate to use a five-year average which minimizes the highs and lows). The most recent KICA data

(2011) resets its retention rate at 64%, while USM's five year average is now 58%. The KICA (six year) graduation rate as reported in our Portfolio was 48%. It now reports 46%. USM's graduation rate as reported in 2008 averaged 35%, while most recent data adjusts that number to 39%.

In 2008 we set as our goal for 2011 a consistent retention rate of 65% and graduation rate of 45%. Clearly we have not made sufficient progress in these areas. Although disappointed, we believe this might be expected given that the new programs we have adopted to improve both retention and graduation rates have only just been implemented, or in some cases are still being implemented. In that spirit, in the new Strategic Plan we continue to set challenging targets in both areas – namely a consistent retention rate of 70% of the end of academic year 2016 and a consistent graduation rate of 50% by the end of AY 2017.

Among the new developments in our plan to improve retention and graduation rates are:

1. the implementation of a new required two-semester First Year Experience, the goal of which is to provide students with the tools they need to meet the challenges of college life and be successful
2. the creation of a Student Success Office, which has been merged with Admissions under a newly created Enrollment Management Director position
3. the development of an early alert system, whereby the student success coaches and faculty advisors are kept informed as to the attendance and academic success of first-year students
4. the embedding of a focused effort within USM's early alert system for student athletes, of whom we have a significant number and for whom greater attention is merited
5. the development of a senior student mentoring program for freshmen on academic probation
6. an extensive review and revision of USM's advising program, targeting especially freshmen and transfers. As noted earlier, this activity took the form of an AQIP Action Project, the initial posting of which can be found at:  
[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/action\\_projects\\_08.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/action_projects_08.htm).

7. a thorough review and upgrading of the university's transcript analysis system. One of the outgrowths of our recent study of advising at USM has been the realization that the University's transcription analysis system, was antiquated and no longer able to provide the support necessary for the larger and more complex institution USM has become. This too became an AQIP Action project, whose goals were stated in its first HLC posting:  
[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/Transcript-Analysis\\_0811.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/Transcript-Analysis_0811.htm)

Considerable progress had been made on this project. To see the latest HLC review of this project follow this link:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Transcript\\_Analysis\\_Action\\_Project\\_Review\\_Sept\\_2011.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Transcript_Analysis_Action_Project_Review_Sept_2011.pdf).

8. a reexamination of the effectiveness of USM's Academic Resource Center. The goals of this AQIP Action Project were stated in the initial posting of this project with the HLC – see:  
[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/AcademicResourceCenter\\_0811.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/AcademicResourceCenter_0811.htm):

“Over the past year, a faculty committee has studied, and made improvements in, our academic remediation offerings in mathematics and writing. That having been accomplished, the committee concluded that the next step is to look at the current Academic Resource Center, which provides tutoring and other forms of assistance to students in need of extra help in various subjects, including, but not limited to, mathematics and writing. To that end, a committee will study current use of the ARC, its

strengths and weaknesses, and other best practice models, and if appropriate, offer suggestions for improvement.”

Our expectation is that this study will be completed, recommendations offered, and implementation begun by the fall of 2012. The latest HLC review of this project can be found at [http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/ARC\\_Action\\_Project\\_Review\\_Sept\\_2011.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/ARC_Action_Project_Review_Sept_2011.pdf).

9. a study of the effectiveness of Student Life, especially Residential Programs, in supporting improved retention and graduation rates. This AQIP Action Project was begun in the fall of 2010 and is still in progress. Its goal was included in its initial posting:

“ In our recent analysis of retention data, we discovered that the retention rate among residential students has fallen below that of commuters. This is contrary to the literature on what is to be expected. We don’t know why this is happening (or even if it can be attributed to Student Life). But we do know that campus life is a factor in student retention. We have decided to study this further to determine its cause or causes and to take remedial action. We have also agreed that even if other factors are involved beyond Student Life, the committee will investigate ways by which the retention rate for students in residence can be improved.” For the complete initial posting, go to:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/ResidenceHall\\_0811.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/ResidenceHall_0811.htm)

For the most recent progress report go to:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Student\\_Life\\_Residence\\_Hall\\_Retention\\_Project\\_Review\\_Sept\\_2011.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Student_Life_Residence_Hall_Retention_Project_Review_Sept_2011.pdf).

To reiterate, none of these initiatives have been in place for longer than two years, while some are still in the planning stages. Thus our earlier comment about it perhaps being too soon to see any improvement in our numbers on retention and graduation rates.

Moving away from the academic side of life at USM, we would like to mention briefly two other initiatives that were prompted, directly or indirectly, by our Portfolio Assessment and that resulted in Action Projects: Faculty and Staff Compensation and Developing of a University-wide Client Improvement Plan.

#### ***Improving Employee Benefits and Compensation Program.***

This Action Project was initiated in 2008 and completed in September 2011. Its goal was stated in its initial posting:

“Improving employee compensation and benefit programs will improve recruitment and retention of quality employees. A thorough understanding of current compensation and benefit programs taken with a review of internal and external competitive environments will result in recommendations to improve compensation and benefit programs. Recommendations will provide more internal compensation equity and result in improving our position in the competitive employment marketplace. The recommendations for changes in compensation and benefit programs will also be done in a cost effective manner appropriate to available resources of the university.”

The full initial posting can be found at:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/action\\_projects\\_06.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/action_projects_06.htm)

In its final report, the project committee noted:

“[The university studied comparable faculty salary levels at peer institutions, and put into effect a multiyear “leveling up” where necessary. That process is nearing completion. The committee then

changed the scope of the project and reconstituted itself to focus on faculty and staff benefits.] The Committee met several times and developed a benefits survey. The benefits survey included questions regarding the university's current benefits and solicited input for potential changes in the current benefit offerings. The survey was distributed to all full-time employees for completion. We had an excellent response rate of over 65%. The results of the survey have been compiled and were reviewed by the Committee.

Information on current employee benefit trends has also been gathered as a resource to consider alternatives to our current benefit offerings. This information, taken with the results of the survey noted above and consideration of available resources will allow the Committee to review and possibly redesign employee benefit offerings.

The Committee made a few changes in the current benefit offerings. Significant changes were not done due to several factors. First, there was concern on the impact of the upcoming implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on the current health insurance benefit program. Second, recent changes in ownership structure of a sister organization, with which we partner on several benefit programs, has created some uncertainty in possible changes in current benefit programs in which we share, since the sister organization takes the lead on certain benefit plan design and programs. In addition, this relationship has also restricted the options available to us should we decide to make significant changes in these shared programs.”

For the full text of the final report go to:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/HLC\\_Employee\\_Comp\\_Action\\_Project\\_Report.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/HLC_Employee_Comp_Action_Project_Report.pdf).

As an outgrowth of the Employee Benefits and Compensation Program, but not included in it, USM conducted a study of adjunct salaries at peer institutions. The study showed that USM was below the average in its adjunct compensation. To rectify the situation, the Administrative Council approved a new compensation package, which will include not only a 25% increase in base salary but that would also include a salary scale for increases based on the degree held by the adjunct (e.g. Masters or Doctorate) and years in service to the University. As full implementation of this proposed scale will substantially impact the University's budget, the administration decided to implement it in stages. In January 2012, half of the base salary increase will be provided. In the Fall of 2012, the first step in the longevity scale will be implemented.

#### ***Develop a University-wide Client Improvement Plan***

The initial posting of this AQIP Action project can be found at:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action\\_projects/action\\_projects\\_07.htm](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/action_projects/action_projects_07.htm)

Its goals were stated therein:

“The goal is to improve delivery of client service to our internal and external audiences through systemic processes and measurable outcomes. USM's reputation for good client service will improve to exceptional client service (the university will need to define these levels). This will further the university's mission by challenging our employees to reach their professional potential by providing exceptional service, while demonstrating our core value of respect to students. We will establish a service theme and service standards, develop a process for regular service assessment, and train front line staff in areas of improvement identified through the assessment process.”

In its final report, the committee noted:

“We have established processes and procedures that can now be ongoing measures for the delivery of quality client service at USM. With the final publishing of our Saint Mary Way Resource Guide, outlining USM service standards and guidelines this fall, and subsequent introduction and training, we feel there is no need to keep this AQIP project open.”

The full, final report can be found at:

[http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011\\_HLC\\_Documents/Quality\\_Client\\_Service\\_AQIP\\_Update\\_September\\_2010.pdf](http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/pdf/2011_HLC_Documents/Quality_Client_Service_AQIP_Update_September_2010.pdf).

To this I would add three outgrowths of this Action Project: a more formal and detailed staff orientation, to which has been added a faculty “overlay” and a new orientation for department chairs.

### *A New Staff Orientation*

The introduction to the New Staff Orientation, which includes faculty, reads:

“A key step toward the fulfillment of [USM’s] mission is to prepare and educate our faculty and staff to understand the values and purpose of the university, and to give them all of the tools necessary to facilitate the development of our most cherished resource—our students. To that end, USM is committed to staff & faculty development, which begins with an orientation program that gives our new employees a solid grounding in the workings of our institution.

USM recognizes that the orientation needs of our employees differ between faculty and staff and from department to department. But every employee needs a foundation in the basics of working at USM. The design of the orientation session all new employees attend helps meet that need.”

The complete document on Staff Orientation can be found at:

<http://www.stmary.edu/aqip/NewEmployeeOrientation.htm>

The reader will note that the document includes a link to a **Faculty Orientation**, which is an extension of the Staff Orientation, which is to say the addition of information unique to faculty.

The goals of the faculty orientation overlay are as follows:

“The goals of the Faculty Orientation Program are centered on that which we value: Community, Respect, Justice and Excellence. With these values in mind, the program seeks to provide new faculty with information about the resources available on campus while encouraging new faculty to become familiar with the campus culture through an understanding of the rich history and current relationships with the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth. Additionally, this program serves to provide a form of mentorship through departmental relationships and further reinforce and enhance the understanding of experienced faculty. While there are specific activities where all gather for orientation activities, it is further envisioned that this will be an ongoing educational experience for all concerned.”

Although on-ground adjunct faculty are highly encouraged to participate in this orientation, obstacles exist – none the least of which are competing schedules and responsibilities – that make it very difficult, if not impossible for many. Therefore the next step in our process is to put as much of our orientation program as possible online, so that new adjunct faculty have access to it and can revisit it as needed.

This online version of our faculty orientation program will be made available to online adjunct faculty as well, which in turn will overlay an already existing orientation provided by our online course/program marketer Deltak. NOTE: Adjunct faculty, both on-ground and online, are evaluated annually in the same way as full-time faculty with chair, student, and occasionally peer performance reviews.