

Systems Portfolio Friends University

6/4/2018

1 - Helping Students Learn

1.1 - Common Learning Outcomes

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

1P1: PROCESSES

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

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

1R1: RESULTS

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

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

1I1: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

1P1a. Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)

Friends University, a Christian University of Quaker heritage, equips students to honor God and serve others by integrating their intellectual, spiritual and professional lives. This Mission statement guides us as we serve our students and forms the foundation for our curricular and co-curricular programs and common learning outcomes.

The General Education Program is effectively our university's largest program, serving students across our traditional and adult undergraduate populations. The program is governed by the Undergraduate General Education Outcomes Committee, which includes faculty from each undergraduate division, Academic Deans, VP of Academic Affairs, Registrar, and Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. This committee meets monthly and is responsible for all facets of the program, including program development, mission alignment, course inclusion, and outcomes assessments (Exhibit 1P1a.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 58\)](#)). Any modifications to this program are approved through the Academic Governance process (as described in section 1P4a), ensuring mission alignment and appropriateness of offerings.

1P1b. Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)

In AY 2015-2016, the General Education Committee began developing a revised framework for the General Education Program. The revised program leans heavily upon established general education models including the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AACU) Essential Learning Outcomes (Exhibit 1P1b.1: [AACU - Essential Learning Outcomes - 2018](#)), the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) General Education Transfer Policy (Exhibit 1P1b.2: [KBOR - General Education Transfer Policy - 2018 \(Page 1\)](#)), and Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) guidance. Within the program are eight goals that align with the University Mission, supporting intellectual, spiritual, and professional development. These eight goals are sub-divided into specific learning outcomes, derived from the AACU Value Rubrics, University of Kansas (KU) Core General Education Goals, and internally developed religion outcomes:

1. Intellectual and Practical Skills
2. Quantitative Literacy
3. Communication Skills
4. Breadth of Knowledge
5. Culture and Diversity
6. Professional and Social Responsibility
7. Integrated, Applied, Learning, Creativity
8. Religion

In AY 2016-2017 courses were vetted by the committee for inclusion in the revised General Education Program. Existing general education courses, along with several new courses, were reviewed for alignment with general education goals and appropriate coverage of outcomes within goals, and, as appropriate, included in the new program. Additional requests for new course inclusions are submitted to and reviewed by the General Education Committee.

As of AY 2017-2018, the revised General Education Program is now in use.

1P1c. Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)

“Every undergraduate student who graduates from Friends University will complete a general education program intentionally designed to build essential skills and prepare you for a diverse and ever-changing work environment. General Education courses are provided by different academic divisions to provide a cross-discipline approach to developing skills in critical thinking, quantitative analysis, written and verbal communication, and collaboration with peers from different disciplines.” This program purpose, along with the content, goals, and intended learning outcomes are publicly articulated through our updated General Education webpages (Exhibit 1P1c.1: [Friends University Website - General Education - 2018](#)).

Additionally, each outcome is aligned with a 4-point rubric (the vast majority of which are externally validated AACU Value Rubrics) to be used by faculty in assessing student artifacts within each general education course. To demonstrate satisfactory student learning, outcomes must be assessed at an average score of 2.5 for 100 level courses and 3.0 for 200-level courses and higher.

1P1d. Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)

Every undergraduate degree at the University requires completion of the General Education curriculum, with 45 credit hours required for traditional undergraduate students and 43 credit hours required for adult undergraduate students. Each degree requires coverage of all 8 General Education Goals (Exhibit 1P1d.1: [Institutional Research - Gen Ed Outcomes Map - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Friends also maintains policies to allow the transfer in of coursework to satisfy general education requirements. Friends will grant 30 hours of General Education credit upon entrance to students who have successfully completed an International Baccalaureate Diploma (Exhibit 1P1d.2: [Course Catalog](#)). The University also has Articulation Agreements with multiple Kansas community colleges to allow associate’s degree-holders to transfer in with junior standing and in many cases transfer credit directly towards our General Education requirements (Exhibit 1P1d.3: [Friends University Website - Articulation Agreements - 2018](#)).

1P1e. Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)

As the General Education outcomes were reviewed and updated in AY 2015-2016, we believe these goals to be relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs. As we accumulate longitudinal outcomes assessment data, we will have a basis for continuous improvement within our framework by adjusting the courses included in the program as well as the outcomes aligned to the goals. Additionally, the AACU Essential Learning Outcomes (implemented in 2010) and the KBOR General Education Transfer Policy (implemented in 2012) upon which our framework was built are recently developed and the current models still in use. Our General Education Committee will continue to review these and other external frameworks to ensure relevance and alignment with student, workplace and societal needs.

Our undergraduate programs include specialized coursework to address traditional and adult student learning needs and prepare them to successfully complete their programs. Traditional students are required to take GNST 110 and 111 (Friends Experience) or HNRS 110 and 111 (Introduction to Honors I and II), which transition new students to the university community, paying special attention to issues of academic success, growth, faith, acceptance, and connection. Adult students are required to take CAPS 200 (Principles and Skills of Adult Learning), which aligns with learning expectations supported through research-based studies promoting andragogy.

1P1f. Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

A wide array of curricular activities to support learning are available to students at all levels within the University, including residence life, academic honors societies, student organizations, athletics, fine arts, and academic research.

Residence Life maintains co-curricular activities targeted primarily to our traditional undergraduate students. Their co-curricular goals and learning outcomes are managed in the Student Affairs division by the Director of Residence Life and VP of Student Affairs. These goals and outcomes were developed in 2012 and align strongly with the University Mission, supporting intellectual, spiritual, and professional development and are articulated publicly on our Residence Life webpage (Exhibit 1P1f.1: [Friends University Website - Residence Life - 2018](#); Exhibit 1P1f.2: [Student Affairs - Residence Life Program Outcomes - AY 2017-2018](#)). Five of the six Residence Life outcomes noted below directly align with the General Education goals (asterisked below), providing strong integration between curricular and co-curricular programs:

1. *Social
2. *Spiritual/Religious Values
3. *Academic/Professional Development
4. Health & Wellness
5. *Diversity
6. *Civic Responsibility

Academic honors societies and other student organizations are available across our traditional undergraduate, adult undergraduate, and graduate student populations. We currently offer faculty-sponsored general academic honors societies for both traditional undergraduates (Alpha Chi) and adult undergraduates (Alpha Sigma Lambda). Additionally, there are 24 faculty and staff-sponsored student organizations including wide-ranging activities such as student government, academic clubs, fine arts performance clubs, intramural teams, and leadership development organizations (Exhibit 1P1f.3: [Friends University Website - Student Organizations - 2018](#)), which are established under the guidelines developed by Student Affairs (Exhibit 1P1f.4: [Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 7\)](#)). The organizations must demonstrate that the mission, purpose, and goals of the student club or organization must contribute to the overall educational mission of Friends University, among other items, in order to gain approval from the Student Government Association (SGA) Executive Council and then ultimately the President's Cabinet.

Numerous athletic opportunities exist for our traditional undergraduate students, including 16 varsity sports programs, through membership in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) and the Kansas Collegiate Athletic Conference (KCAC), and a variety of intramural programs. More than half of our traditional undergraduate students participate in varsity athletics annually. These programs are overseen by the Athletic Director, who, in conjunction with coaches, VP of Student Affairs academic leadership, faculty, and academic support services, integrate academic and co-curricular experiences through Mission alignment and academic support programming (e.g., student-athlete study hall and early-alert academic progress systems). Student-athlete academic performance is routinely measured within the university and evaluated against other programs within our athletic conference. The Division of Student Affairs offers additional indirect assessment of student-athlete experiences through annual surveys, asking student-athletes to evaluate the effectiveness of coaches from athletic standpoints as well as how effectively they support of University Mission and Values and academic requirements.

The University also offers a plethora of opportunities for involvement in the fine arts, in which nearly one third of our traditional undergraduate students participate annually. Performance opportunities exist in vocal and instrumental music, theater, ballet, and visual arts, many of which are open to the Wichita community (Exhibit 1P1f.5: [Marketing - Fine Arts Booklet - AY 2017-2018](#)). Several faculty-sponsored fine arts student organizations also provide co-curricular opportunities for student engagement (Exhibit 1P1f.6: [Friends University Website - Fine Arts Involvement - 2018](#)).

1P1g. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)

Given the breadth of areas addressing common learning outcomes, we employ a variety of assessment tools, methods, and instruments. University-wide assessment tools (e.g., national assessment instruments as noted in 1P1h) are selected by academic leadership and the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. More specific assessments are selected and/or developed by faculty and staff from the programs in question, often in consultation with the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation to ensure best-practices and systems are leveraged appropriately. Sections 1P1h and 1I1 provide further detail on the systems recently developed and deployed to store and report general education assessment data.

1P1h. Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

As part of the new General Education program, faculty leading general education courses are required to assess general education outcomes from course-embedded artifacts each semester. The assessment results are stored systematically in our Learning Management System and then compiled and analyzed by the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. Assessment reports are then provided to the General Education Committee each semester, which serve to affirm appropriate student learning or indicate potential corrective actions needed.

Residence Life co-curricular outcomes are assessed indirectly each year through Resident Assistants (RA) Evaluations by their respective resident students (Exhibit 1P1h.1: [Student Affairs - Residence Life Resident Assistant Evaluation - AY 2017-2018](#)). Evaluation data are accumulated and analyzed by the Director of Residence Life and distributed to Student Affairs Leadership. Additionally, individual RA evaluation reports are shared by the Director of Residence Life with each RA and provide a framework for continuous improvement and coaching discussions.

In AY 2016-2017, we began assessing athletics co-curricular outcomes indirectly through an annual Coach Evaluation (Exhibit 1P1h.2: [Student Affairs - Coach Evaluations - AY 2016-2018](#)).

In addition to the aforementioned direct and indirect assessments of common learning outcomes, Friends University routinely administers several nationally normed surveys to assess student engagement and satisfaction. Currently on three-year cycles, we administer the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to traditional undergraduate and adult undergraduate students; the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) to traditional undergraduate students; and the Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS) to adult undergraduate and graduate students. The surveys are administered by the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation, with results compiled in aggregate, as well as disaggregated by college and division. Reports are shared and discussed on multiple levels, including at President's Cabinet meetings, faculty retreats, academic college and division meetings, and student affairs meetings. As appropriate, these survey results aid in developing university initiatives and drive continuous improvement.

1R1: What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level?

General Education

From AY 2013-2014 through 2016-2017 we administered the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency Profile exam to assess student proficiency in the General Education program. The exams were typically administered during the semester of student graduation. In late summer, the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation would compile, analyze, and share data with faculty and administration for review (including presentation of the reporting to the General Education Committee and at Faculty Retreat). Data were disaggregated by various academic divisions and student characteristics and compared longitudinally to identify any significant trends; additional external comparisons were made against 6-year score averages from 3 comparative school sets and the entire ETS General Education dataset. Results indicated total and subset scores typically near the midpoint of the comparative data sets (a satisfactory mark), but with a decline in average score during the years in which the survey was administered. Additional analyses also indicated a declining ACT score profile of the test completers for the years in question, which may explain much of the decline in ETS test score (Exhibit 1R1.1: [Institutional Research - ETS General Education Comparative Analysis - 2013-2017](#)).

Beginning in AY 2017-2018, the General Education program transitioned to direct assessment of program learning outcomes through course-embedded artifacts. While use of ETS exam data provided external comparability, the use of course-embedded artifacts provide several benefits, including: the ability to assess the full breadth of the program (e.g., including religion); more timely, specific, and actionable feedback of student learning; and a more direct linkage between the content taught in the program and what is being assessed.

We now have two semesters of assessment data available from our new process. Initial analyses have yielded a mixture of results including: affirming satisfactory student learning for the majority of courses and outcomes, identifying opportunities to normalize assessments within different sections of like courses, modifying assessment instruments, and modifying course curriculum. Within some courses, we have also added indirect assessment and goals through the use of specific progress on relevant objective(s) feedback from IDEA student rating of faculty instruction data. Overall, results indicate satisfactory student learning for the majority of general education outcomes (as defined by an average assessment score of 2.5 or greater for 100-level courses and 3.0 or greater for 200-level courses and above on a 4-point scale) (Table 1R1.1). Assessment data for AY 2018-2019 will be particularly interesting as we will be able to review the impact of changes made this AY and accumulate a more longitudinal data set (Exhibit 1R1.2: [Institutional Research - Gen Ed Outcomes Map and Assessment - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Table 1R1.1: General Education Assessment Summary				
	Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
Goal	Assessment	Vs. Goal	Assessment	Vs. Goal

1: Intellectual and Practical Skills	3.3	0.7	3.3	0.8
2: Quantitative Literacy	3.2	0.6	2.6	0.1
3: Communication Skills	3.0	0.1	3.3	0.5
4: Breadth of Knowledge	3.2	0.5	2.9	0.3
5: Culture and Diversity	3.3	0.2	3.2	0.2
6: Personal and Social Responsibility	3.1	0.4	2.5	0.0
7: Integration, Applied, Learning, Creativity	2.9	(0.1)	3.0	0.0
8: Religion	2.9	(0.1)	2.9	0.2

Residence Life

The Director of Residence Life reviews RA evaluation data annually in aggregate to review program-level effectiveness and disaggregated to individual RAs to facilitate coaching conversations. AY 2017-2018 data indicate achievement of most general goals and Residence Life learning outcomes with some opportunities to better impact student learning specific to spiritual/religious values (Exhibit 1R1.3: [Student Affairs - Residence Assistant Evaluations - 2018](#)).

Athletics

We maintain an emphasis on student-athletes performing well in the classroom as well as on the field. One measure of our success in developing well-rounded student-athletes is through GPA comparisons of our athletic teams against those in our KICA conference. Data from AY 2016-2017 indicate that when compared to athletic teams from the 10 other schools in the conference, we have the highest average team GPAs in five of 18 teams. Additionally, seven teams have average team GPAs of 3.5 or higher; 12 have average team GPAs of 3.25 or higher (Exhibit 1R1.4: [Student Affairs - KICA Scholar Team GPAs - AY 2016-2017](#)).

Our Coach Evaluations indicate largely positive results, affirming that most coaches are meeting goals for the various outcomes. The data also identify a few opportunities for development conversations with specific coaches and broader discussion about outcomes across the coaches (Exhibit 1R1.5: [Student Affairs - Coach Evaluations - AY 2016-2018](#)).

Additional Indirect Assessment Measures

Results from our NSSE administrations are segmented into two areas: High-Impact Practices (HIP) and Engagement Indicators (EI) (Exhibit 1R1.6: [Institutional Research - NSSE High-Impact Practices - 2017](#); Exhibit 1R1.7: [Institutional Research - NSSE High-Impact Practices - 2014](#)). In reviewing our results, comparisons to peer school sets, and potential for student impact, we decided to focus more intently on improving student participation in HIPs. Accordingly, as part of the University's Revitalization and Growth Plan (Exhibit 1R1.8: [Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 \(Page 8\)](#)), we developed a Pathway to Profession program (Exhibit 1R1.9: [Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018](#)) that, as part of its charge would

“revitalize and infuse internships...study abroad, and faculty-student research projects” (three of six HIPs). Collaborative efforts were made between career services, faculty, and marketing to centralize and promote internship opportunities to traditional undergraduate students. Faculty have also received additional university funding to develop new study abroad experiences (e.g., a Health Science study abroad to Ghana launched in AY 2017-2018 (Exhibit 1R1.10: [Marketing - Ghana Study abroad - AY 2017-2018](#)) and research activities (e.g., Psychology research on brainwave activity launched in AY 2017-2018). Results from the 2017 NSSE administration highlight significant improvements in participation of traditional undergraduate students along with modest improvements in participation in study abroad and research with faculty (Table 1R1.2).

High Impact Practice	2014 HIP participation rate	2014 peer HIP participation range*	2017 HIP participation rate	2017 peer HIP participation range**
Internship or Field Experience	56%	44% – 66%	68%	50% – 57%
Research with Faculty	19%	18% – 38%	20%	23% – 29%
Study Abroad	15%	11% – 25%	19%	8% – 16%
<i>*2014 Peer Sets: Plains Private, MastersL Pvt, and CanUGProfile Size</i>				
<i>**2017 Peer Sets: KICA Schools, MastersL Pvt, and AQIP Peer Group</i>				

Complementing the NSSE, the SSI and ASPS instruments help us gauge how important various aspects of the students’ experience are and how well these expectations are being met (Exhibits 1R1.111: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(CAPS\) - 2016](#); 1R1.12: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(GRAD\) - 2016](#); 1R1.13: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(CAPS\) - 2012](#); and 1R1.14: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(GRAD\) - 2012](#)). While results typically indicate a more satisfied student body than other schools administering these surveys, we do still implement process changes based upon the feedback received. As example, within our ASPS results academic advising has consistently been a top 3 category for Friends in terms of importance yet the performance gap, while favorable compared to national averages, has still indicated opportunity for improvement. From this feedback, we have re-organized our Academic Success Coaches to serve students based on majors, as opposed to previous alphabetical student assignment, and improved the utilization of our Falcon Map tool for academic advising, helping improve our performance in this area (Table 1R1.3).

	Importance	Satisfaction / StaDev.	Gap	Importance	Satisfaction / StaDev.	Gap	Mean Diff.

AUG (2016)	6.47	5.97 / 1.18	0.50	6.51	5.87 / 1.18	0.64	0.10
AUG (2012)	6.31	5.40 / 1.20	0.91	6.45	5.62 / 1.23	0.83	0.22***
GRAD (2016)	6.52	6.21 / 0.85	0.31	6.51	5.87 / 1.18	0.64	0.34*
GRAD (2012)	6.25	5.80 / 1.04	0.45	6.45	5.62 / 1.23	0.83	0.18**
<i>*, **, ***Difference statistically significant at the .05 level, .01 level, and .001 level, respectively</i>							

1I1: Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

General Education

We have several major initiatives under-way to enhance the assessment of our revised General Education program learning outcomes. In an effort to align the outcomes assessment more closely with program content, we transitioned in AY 2017-2018 from direct assessment of program learning outcomes through ETS General Education tests to assessment through course-embedded artifacts, as noted in section 1R1. In support of this new process, we have enhanced our existing Learning Management System (LMS), Moodle, to record outcomes assessments and store artifacts. Data from the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters has enabled us to undertake our initial program review under the new General Education model and has already served as an impetus for components of several courses to be redesigned.

To facilitate a program review process that includes assessment data, Friends University expanded its partnership with LiveText in 2017, purchasing their Assessment Insight System (AIS). While initially envisioned as an assessment mapping tool for the General Education program (and Education and Family Therapy programs, which also use LiveText assessment and e-portfolio system), the use of AIS has grown to encompass program review for all University programs. AIS has allowed us to centralize data for learning outcomes, curriculum maps, assessment plans, assessment findings, and any resulting actions plans, facilitating a more streamlined and comprehensive program review process.

Community Engagement and Service-Learning

The University is increasing community engagement and service-learning through a new partnership with Love Your Community, Inc. is a local non-profit organization. In conjunction with new student orientation and our Friends Experience course, students will engage in a local neighborhood clean-up project and discuss the impact of their efforts on the community (Exhibit 1I1.1: [Marketing - Orientation Community Service Project - 2018](#)).

Program Alumni Surveys

Seeking to enhance the data available from university graduates, new program alumni surveys were developed and administered in AY 2017-2018. The initial administration surveyed alumni from one to five years out, with subsequent annual administrations surveying graduates one and four years out. These surveys evaluate several measures of curricular, co-curricular, and post-graduation achievement. Relative to common learning outcomes, both the undergraduate and graduate surveys evaluate the effectiveness of several co-curricular and student support services, with the undergraduate survey additionally evaluating the effectiveness of our general education goals (Exhibit 111.2: [Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018](#); Exhibit 111.3: [Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - CAPS - BBA Business Management - 2018](#)).

Sources

- AACU - Essential Learning Outcomes - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 58)
- Academic Affairs - IRB Guidelines and Application - 2009
- Friends University Website - Articulation Agreements - 2018
- Friends University Website - Fine Arts Involvement - 2018
- Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018
- Friends University Website - General Education - 2018
- Friends University Website - Residence Life - 2018
- Friends University Website - Student Organizations - 2018
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2012
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2016
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2012
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2016
- Institutional Research - ETS General Education Comparative Analysis - 2013-2017
- Institutional Research - Gen Ed Outcomes Map - AY 2017-2018
- Institutional Research - Gen Ed Outcomes Map and Assessment - AY 2017-2018
- Institutional Research - NSSE High-Impact Practices - 2014
- Institutional Research - NSSE High-Impact Practices - 2017
- Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - CAPS - BBA Business Management - 2018
- Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018
- KBOR - General Education Transfer Policy - 2018
- KBOR - General Education Transfer Policy - 2018 (page number 1)
- Marketing - Fine Arts Booklet - AY 2017-2018
- Marketing - Ghana Study abroad - AY 2017-2018
- Marketing - Orientation Community Service Project - 2018
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 8)
- Student Affairs - Coach Evaluation Form - AY 2017-2018
- Student Affairs - Coach Evaluations - AY 2016-2018
- Student Affairs - Coach Evaluations - AY 2017-2018
- Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018

- Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 7)
- Student Affairs - KICA Scholar Team GPAs - AY 2016-2017
- Student Affairs - Residence Assistant Evaluations - 2018
- Student Affairs - Residence Life Program Outcomes - AY 2017-2018
- Student Affairs - Residence Life Resident Assistant Evaluation - AY 2017-2018

1.2 - Program Learning Outcomes

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

1P2: PROCESSES

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

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

1R2: RESULTS

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

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

1I2: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

1P2a. Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the

institution (3.E.2)

Friends University, a Christian University of Quaker heritage, equips students to honor God and serve others by integrating their intellectual, spiritual and professional lives. This Mission statement guides us as we serve our students and forms the foundation for our curricular programs and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

The University ensures that PLOs are aligned with the university's mission, educational offerings, and degree levels through the academic governance process. The academic governance process ensures that new programs, as well as changes to existing programs, are thoroughly vetted by college faculty. PLOs are initially developed by the faculty sponsor(s) responsible for submitting a new program request (or change(s) to an existing program). These PLOs and accompanying proposals are reviewed by the division/program director, who may then approve and forward (along with any suggested modifications) to the college's Academic Council. If approved, proposals are moved to the university's Academic Cabinet for final review and approval. The Academic Cabinet is composed of eight faculty members (four from each college) and is chaired by the VP of Academic Affairs (who votes only in the case of a tie). This extensive review process enables various groups of faculty to vet proposals for new programs or changes to existing programs in order to ensure that they are consistent with the university's mission, do not overlap or infringe on existing programs, and are appropriate for the degree level at which the program is offered.

Reaffirmation of PLO alignment also occurs through the program review process.

1P2b. Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)

PLO development is a faculty-led process, incorporating feedback from multiple internal and external sources. Faculty are supported in the development of their PLOs by other faculty representatives and academic leadership throughout the academic governance process, as described in section 1P2a. This process affords multiple feedback points to review and strengthen PLOs, ensuring that they are representative of the program curricula, align with relevant external standards, are comparable to similar external programs, and are able to be appropriately measured. We also leverage expertise from our marketing department, market-research consulting groups (e.g., Eduventures), the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation, advisory boards, and student-feedback. These agencies and groups provide the collective wisdom that aligns student-learning experiences with program outcomes.

Further key resources in PLO determination are external standards (e.g., government agencies and accrediting bodies), to which many of our programs align, including programs with and without specialized accreditations. Alignment to standards for accredited programs are reviewed by:

- The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for education programs
- The Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE) for the Marriage and Family Therapy program
- The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) for music programs

Several non-accredited programs align themselves according to external standards:

- The Health Care Leadership program aligns to and is recognized by the American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE)
- The Cyber Security programs are aligned to the knowledge units associated with the NSA

Center for Academic Excellence

- The Accounting programs aligns to the Kansas Board of Accountancy required course work in order to sit for the Certified Public Accountant (CPA) exam
- The Human Resources program aligns to the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) standards and has received SHRM recognition
- The Criminal Justice program aligns to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) standards
- In addition, a strong interest in achieving recognition from the Accreditation Council for Business Schools & Programs (ACBSP) for selected business programs maintains the interest for their alignment with professional learning expectations

As noted in section 1P2a, PLOs are ultimately approved through the academic governance process by the appropriate college's Academic Council and Academic Cabinet, ensuring a comprehensive review of PLOs for all programs.

1P2c. Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)

The University website articulates the purposes, content, and level of achievement of PLOs. Each program has a webpage that lists the PLOs and career options for which the program prepares students; additional marketing materials such as program specific brochures also detail this information. The courses and course descriptions within each program are detailed within the Academic Catalog (Exhibit 1P2c.1: [Course Catalog](#)). Additionally, the syllabi for each course articulate the PLOs and introduce the content and level of achievement for Course Learning Outcomes, which are formative parts of the PLOs.

1P2d. Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)

The University ensures relevance and alignment of PLOs with student, workplace, and societal needs primarily through adherence to specialized accrediting standards and other credentialing bodies. As of Fall 2017, nearly one third of our full-time students were enrolled in specialized accredited programs, with many more studying in programs that align with other credentialing or accrediting standards (e.g., including those listed in section 1P2b). Additionally, many programs have advisory boards that regularly meet with faculty to review outcomes. Workplace and societal feedback is also received as part of employer surveys (career fair surveys, program/university-level surveys, and candidate performance feedback) and in meeting and partnering with local businesses.

In AY 2017-2018, we developed new program alumni surveys, available for all programs not already using established alumni surveys (e.g., Education and Marriage and Family Therapy programs). These will be administered annually and provide opportunity to gauge PLO relevance and alignment to student, workplace, and societal needs. Furthermore, PLOs are reviewed extensively during annual program assessment and during the program review process.

As noted in section 1P1e, all undergraduate students are required to take initial coursework (either GNST 110 and GNST 111, HNRS 110 and HNRS 111, or CAPS 200) to transition traditional students and adult learners to the university community and prepare them with the academic success skills necessary to succeed in their program of study.

Graduate business programs offer fundamental courses in leadership and technology as well as finance and accounting to refresh or establish a baseline of knowledge needed for success in graduate programs. Other graduate programs have clearly articulated admission expectations ensuring

applicants possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful in the program of study.

1P2e. Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

Faculty often lead the design, alignment, and delivery of co-curricular activities that are directly related to PLOs. These activities are typically conducted through various student organizations (Exhibit 1P2e.1: [Friends University Website - Student Organizations - 2018](#)), which are established under the guidelines developed by Student Affairs (Exhibit 1P2e.2: [Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 7\)](#)). The organizations must demonstrate that the mission, purpose, and goals of the student club or organization contribute to the overall educational mission of Friends University, among other items, and gain approval from the Student Government Association (SGA) Executive Council and then ultimately the President's Cabinet. Faculty may sponsor local chapters of nationally established programs, delivering co-curricular activities based on standards and guidance of the national organization(s), such as:

- Academic Honors Societies
- Kappa Pi, providing Art and Design students with a scholastic and career-development-oriented networking group
- National Association of Women MBA's (NAWMBA), dedicated to empowering female business professionals, assisting women into leadership and enhancing the diversity of the workforce

Faculty also develop their own student organizations and activities to align with and support the PLOs of their specific program, such as:

- Monthly professional development events that Marriage and Family Therapy students attend along with licensed therapists
- Psychology Club, for professional development and enrichment, which incorporates service-learning activities such as the Urban Plunge
- Singing Quakers, an auditioned choir consisting of music majors and non-majors who have had significant choral experience
- Spanish Club, open to all students who are interested in community projects related to Spanish-speaking communities

Additional activities are developed by academic support services and student life in conjunction with faculty. Such co-curricular activities are often modeled after nationally established programs and best practices. Examples include:

- Academic Resource Center developing Supplemental Instruction targeted towards high enrollment, high "D, F, or WD" rate courses
- Residence Life piloting learning communities for students in specific majors (e.g., Zoo Science)

A number of Friends University students have the opportunity to participate in research projects under the supervision of a faculty member. The University's Innovation Grant program provides mini-grants to faculty and students who plan to conduct a project together (Exhibit 1P2e.3: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 32\)](#)). Such projects are based on the interests of the student and the supervising faculty member. Some academic programs have also included student research as a feature of the program. For example, the Psychology/Human Services program invites and supports students from the Psychology Research Methods and Senior Seminar courses to present

papers at regional conferences. Students typically present papers at the Association for Psychological Research in Kansas conference in the fall semester and the Great Plains Student Psychology Convention during the spring semester. The Honors Program also requires students to conduct an independent research project, under faculty supervision, during their senior year.

1P2f. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)

A wide variety of tools, methods, and instruments are used to assess the attainment of program learning outcomes (PLOs), which are largely selected by the faculty of the program. Programs with specialized accreditation, and other programs whose curricula align with external bodies (e.g., Accounting and Human Resources), include a strong linkage to the standards and recommended assessment methods of the accrediting/external body. These tools, methods, and instruments are submitted by faculty to their college Deans via annual assessment reports for each program.

Our Education and Family Therapy programs use an e-portfolio system, LiveText C1, to collect student artifacts, link to PLOs and external standards, and store assessment data. These programs also have many clinical experiences through which PLOs are assessed. Our business programs use McGraw-Hill Connect software which provides assessment of PLOs through tests, quizzes, and other online assignments for many of the accounting and finance courses. Similarly, many of our math classes use MathLab to provide assessment of PLOs. In AY 2017-2018 we enhanced our Learning Management System, Moodle, to record assessment of PLOs and link to external standards; Moodle is now the required assessment tool for our General Education program and our adult undergraduate and graduate programs not already using LiveText C1. In AY 2017-2018 we began using a new assessment planning tool, LiveText Assessment Insight System (AIS), for university-wide program review and annual PLO review.

1P2g. Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Review of program outcomes is conducted annually by faculty and the college Deans. Currently, all specialized accredited programs, adult undergraduate programs, and graduate programs participate in this process. Some traditional undergraduate programs have not recently participated in this process due to changes in leadership and staffing. As of AY 2017-2018 all programs now have assessment plans and will conduct annual PLO assessment. As part of this process, the program specifies its PLOs, the instruments used to determine whether objectives were met, the results of the assessment of each objective, and a summary of how the data were used to improve the program. Several variations of periodic assessment reviews take place throughout the university:

- Program Directors and the Dean in the adult undergraduate and graduate programs meet at the end of each spring semester for Data Day
- Faculty within the Education division meet bi-annually with their Professional Education Board-Advisory Council (PEB-AC), which includes faculty, alumni, and educators/employers from within the community, to review key assessment data
- Faculty within the Marriage and Family Therapy program meet quarterly to review all program data
- Faculty within the Fine Arts division meet annually to review assessment data

Faculty typically use direct assessment methods as a primary source of assessment, including course-embedded artifacts (e.g., papers, tests, projects, and/or artistic performances), licensure exams, and standardized tests (e.g., ETS major field tests). Our Education and Family Therapy programs use national exam pass rates (Praxis: Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam in Education and MFT

Exam in Family Therapy) and state licensure exam scores from their candidates as summative assessment instruments. Additionally, our music program uses the ETS Music Major Field Test as a summative assessment instrument.

All programs use indirect assessment data as a secondary assessment source, including course evaluations, program surveys, graduation/alumni surveys, and nationally administered surveys (e.g., National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)). Course evaluations are administered using IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction, allowing us to compare our ratings against nationally normed data sets, and aggregated in multiple ways for further analysis, including at the program level. In Fall 2016, we began administering these surveys online, allowing us to additionally capture our online courses within this data set; previously, online courses were evaluated using internally-developed survey instruments. Programmatic and university-wide surveys are typically internally-developed, with many key surveys created with the assistance of the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. Nationally normed-survey instruments are administered on a rotating multi-year cycle. These, and other university-wide surveys, are disaggregated in multiple ways to present more actionable reporting for various curricular and co-curricular units. Surveys developed within our specialized accredited programs (i.e., Education, Family Therapy, and Music) undergo more rigor in their development, including survey piloting, review by advisory boards, and alignment to accreditation standards.

1R2: What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs?

Programs Assessing Goals

We currently assess PLOs in the majority of the programs offered (Table 1R2.1). For the traditional undergraduate programs that have not recently been assessing PLOs, faculty were required to develop assessment plans in AY 2017-2018. In AY 2018-2019, all undergraduate and graduate programs will assess PLOs annually.

Table 1R2.1: Annual Program Learning Outcome (PLO) Assessments		
	Annual PLO Assessment	
College	Currently Assessed	Will begin in AY 2018-2019
Traditional Undergraduate	18	22
Adult Undergraduate	10	0
Graduate	9	0
Total	37	22

Outcomes Assessment Reports

Adult Undergraduate and Graduate assessment reports are developed and reviewed annually with the Dean and other college faculty during an end of semester Data Day (Exhibit 1R2.1: [Academic](#)

[Affairs - College of Adult and Professional Studies Summary Report - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 1R2.2: [Academic Affairs - College of Adult and Professional Studies Summary Report - AY 2016-2017](#); Exhibit 1R2.3: [Academic Affairs - Graduate School Summary Report - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 1R2.4: [Academic Affairs - Graduate School Summary Report - AY 2016-2017](#)).

Traditional undergraduate assessment data are reviewed annually within the division and by the college Dean (Exhibit 1R2.5: [Academic Affairs - Art Outcomes Report - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 1R2.6: [Academic Affairs - Communications Outcomes Report - AY 2017-2018](#)). These reviews affirm positive aspects of the programs as well as provide a basis for making program or assessment changes.

Additional detail and exhibits for our specialized accredited programs are listed in section 1R4.

Academic Honors Societies

Student membership in academic honors societies affords opportunities for a wide range of the student population (Table 1R2.2). Exemplifying the high standards of these honors societies, our Sigma Delta Pi chapter has received the outstanding national chapter award twelve times for exemplary participation in activities on campus and in the community; our Psi Chi chapter has received awards for model chapter five times, National Chapter of the Year in 2008, and National Outstanding Chapter Advisor in 2016.

College	Honor Society	Area
Traditional Undergraduate	Mu Phi Epsilon	Music
	Psi Chi	Psychology
	Sigma Delta Pi	Spanish
	Sigma Tau Delta	English
Graduate	Delta Kappa	Marriage & Family Therapy

Academic Research

A grant promoting student/faculty research has made a significant difference in the quality and quantity of academic research. Examples from AY 2017-2018 include:

- Dr. Alan Maccarone has continued his 10 year research project on egrets and herons with a senior biology/honors student
- Dr. Josh Halonen has been able to purchase some equipment to conduct a research project on brain activity patterns with students in the biology department
- Dr. John Simmons had several students make presentations at the Kansas Academy of Science Annual Meeting
- Dr. Kassia Waggoner has taken several students to make presentations at a student conference

on writing research

- Dr. Tor Wynn took several students to make presentations at the Midwest Sociological Society Annual Meeting

IDEA Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction

IDEA Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction have been improving slightly across the university since 2014 relative to student-reported Progress on Relevant Objectives (in addition to overall ratings of teacher and course excellence) (Table 1R2.3). Our goal each term is to maintain ratings at or above national averages. At the university and college level, we have met and exceeded national averages in most terms, with the strongest progress recorded by our graduate students. Disaggregation between courses taught by full-time faculty and adjuncts indicates comparable progress on relevant objects; disaggregation between on-ground and online courses indicates an opportunity for relative enhancement of student learning in online courses (Exhibit 1R2.7: [Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017](#)). We believe that additional resources allotted towards online learning technology and pedagogy in AY 2017-2018 will help improve these ratings. Further disaggregation is done at program and faculty levels for more precise analysis and continuous improvement.

Table 1R2.3: IDEA Student Rating of Faculty Instruction Longitudinal Report

	2014		2015		2016			2017			Total
	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP	SU	FA	SP	SU	FA	
Progress on Relevant Objectives	53	54	54	55	55	55	51	49	51	50	52
Standard Deviation (RO)	11.4	10.3	9.9	8.4	10.3	9.5	11.8	12.5	12.7	11.2	11.2
Excellent Teacher	50	51	51	52	51	51	50	49	51	51	50
Standard Deviation (ET)	12.0	11.0	11.1	10.1	11.4	12.2	12.0	13.2	12.1	11.7	11.7
Excellent Course	51	53	52	54	54	55	52	50	52	50	52
Standard Deviation (EC)	12.1	10.9	11.0	9.8	11.4	11.2	12.1	12.7	11.8	12.0	11.7
Summary Evaluation	52	53	53	55	54	54	51	50	51	50	52
Standard Deviation (SE)	11.2	10.1	10.0	8.7	10.3	9.9	11.2	11.7	10.8	10.8	10.8
Course Count	416	393	235	233	319	99	335	385	86	348	2,849
Enrolled	6,091	6,436	4,004	3,787	5,256	1,430	5,324	5,818	1,184	5,935	45,265
Response Count	4,106	4,350	3,169	3,096	2,098	401	2,419	2,526	369	3,233	25,767

Response Rate	67%	68%	79%	82%	40%	28%	45%	43%	31%	54%	57%
<i>*The IDEA instrument was revised in Fall 2016 and consequently the scores were renormalized, explaining the decline in ratings relative to prior terms</i>											
<i>**The IDEA instrument was changed to an online instrument in 2016, which allowed us to additionally survey online courses, but resulted in lower response rates</i>											
<i>***Converted Score Scale (relative to all other courses in the IDEA database): Much Higher - Highest 10% (>62); Higher - Next 20% (56-62); Similar - Middle 40% (45-55); Lower - Next 20% (38-44); Much Lower - Lowest 10% (<38)</i>											

1I2: Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Program Alumni Surveys

As noted in section 1P1, the University administered new program alumni surveys in AY 2017-2018. Relative to program learning outcomes, unique versions were created for each program to specifically assess their program outcomes, in addition to other measures (Exhibit 1I2.1: [Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018](#); Exhibit 1I2.2: [Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - GRAD - MBA Professional Business Administration - 2018](#)).

Center for Faith, Teaching, and Learning

Within our Strategic Plan, one of our key initiatives is to develop a Center for Teaching and Learning (Exhibit 1I2.3: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018](#)).

Institute of Management Accountants Endorsement

The University plans to seek endorsement from the Institute of Management Accountants (IMA) in AY 2018-2019 for its undergraduate and graduate accounting and finance degrees (Exhibit 1I2.4: [IMA - Higher Education Endorsement Program - 2018](#)). This endorsement will signify alignment of these program curricula with the content of the Certified Management Accountant (CMA) exam, preparing students to sit for this exam and bolster their credentials and employment prospects by combining a professional certification with their degree. Our accounting programs currently meet the content standards required for IMA endorsement and our finance faculty are in the process of modifying some course content to allow our finance programs to also meet these content standards (Exhibit 1I2.5: [Academic Affairs - IMA Academic Course Alignment - 2016](#)).

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Art Outcomes Report - AY 2017-2018

- Academic Affairs - College of Adult and Professional Studies Summary Report - AY 2016-2017
- Academic Affairs - College of Adult and Professional Studies Summary Report - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Communications Outcomes Report - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 32)
- Academic Affairs - Graduate School Summary Report - AY 2016-2017
- Academic Affairs - Graduate School Summary Report - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - IMA Academic Course Alignment - 2016
- Friends University Website - Student Organizations - 2018
- IMA - Higher Education Endorsement Program - 2018
- Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017
- Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - GRAD - MBA Professional Business Administration - 2018
- Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Student Affairs - Falcon Student Organizations Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 7)

1.3 - Academic Program Design

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

1P3: PROCESSES

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

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

1R3: RESULTS

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

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

1I3: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

1P3a. Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Friends University serves a diverse student body through a variety of academic and support structures. Analysis of current student demographics as well as local and regional demographic trends inform the identification of and support for a variety of student stakeholder groups. Faculty, administration, and academic staff support the determination of educational needs and establishment

of structures to address these needs (Table 1P3a.1).

Table 1P3a.1: Student Stakeholder Groups and Educational Needs Examples		
Student Stakeholder Group	Approximate Student Population	Educational Needs
Adult Students	50% of total student body	Flexible course offerings, addressed through evening, online, and 8-week course offerings. Review of academic study skills (primarily for adult undergraduate students), addressed through required Principles and Skills of Adult Learning course.
Online Learners	50% of graduate students; 85% of adult undergraduate students	Flexible course offerings, addressed through asynchronous and synchronous course offerings. Access to student support services (student support services are available on-ground and online). Connection to faculty/students, addressed through video-conferencing technology use in the classroom and in required faculty virtual-office hours.
Student-Athletes	55% of traditional undergraduates	Academic/athletic balance and learning support, addressed through required student-athlete study hall.
Minorities	25% of total student body	Additional academic and non-academic support, addressed through the Hispanic Initiative, membership in the Hispanic American Leadership Organization (HALO), and the Latino Leaders program (noted in section 6R1).
First-Generation Students	25% of traditional undergraduate and graduate students; 45% of adult undergraduate students	Additional academic and non-academic support, addressed through required first-year seminars (undergraduate students), new student orientations, and a First Gen Falcons program targeting traditional undergraduate student success beginning in AY 2018-2019.

1P3b. Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Several academic programs maintain advisory boards (e.g., our specialized accredited programs and other graduate and professional programs) consisting of the program director, select faculty and/or administrators, members of the profession, community and business leaders, and alumni (Table 1P3b.1). The Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies also maintains an Adjunct Advisory Board. These advisory boards meet regularly, reviewing topics including course/program curricula, program changes (e.g., the addition or elimination of program concentrations), outcomes assessment, graduate preparation, and local employer needs.

Table 1P3b.1: Academic Advisory Boards

College	Program
Graduate	M.B.A.
	Global M.B.A.
	M.S. Family Therapy
	M.Ed. Teaching and Learning
	M.A. Christian Spiritual Formation & Leadership
Traditional Undergraduate	Education (includes all education programs)
	B.A. Christian Spiritual Formation
	B.A. Spanish
Adult Undergraduate	B.S. Elementary Education

Alumni, employer, and community stakeholder relationships are described in section 2P3a. The relationships provide avenues for faculty, staff, and administration to identify other key stakeholder groups and their needs.

1P3c. Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders’ needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

The University develops and improves responsive programming in a variety of ways. Several programs maintain specialized accreditations or align their curricula to external standards (noted in section 1P2b). These program alignments provide faculty with access to a variety of professional resources that inform program design and support responsiveness to stakeholder needs and currency of program curricula. Similarly, many faculty obtain ongoing continuing professional education, including conference attendance and presentations, publications, research, and other professional certification requirements. These opportunities help them to remain current within their fields and allow them to review and respond to changing needs through their academic program design. Additionally, links to employers and community organizations through advisory boards and other partnerships (noted in sections 2P3 and 2P5) provide faculty and administrators with direct connections to stakeholders and allow the University to more effectively and responsively develop and update programs.

1P3d. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs

Assessment of common and program learning outcomes (noted in sections 1P1 and 1P2) identifies how effectively students learn stated objectives. Graduation and program alumni surveys (noted in sections 1I1, 1I2, and 1R4) identify how effectively academic programs prepare students for post-graduation success (e.g., employment) as do individual and focus group feedback directly from employers. Additionally, program admissions, retention, and graduation data (collected and reported by the Admissions and Institutional Research Offices) are used as indicators of program attractiveness (related to currency) and effectiveness.

1P3e. Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

Review of course and program viability are done on an ongoing basis by both faculty and administration (with administration focusing on program viability). Course changes or discontinuations are typically based upon enrollment trends, student learning assessment data, and/or feedback from students, faculty, advisory board members, and other stakeholders. Program changes or discontinuations are typically proposed based upon enrollment, retention, and completion trend data, published bi-annually in the Fact Book (Exhibit 1P3e.1: [Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018](#)), external program review analyses (Exhibit 1P3e.2: [Marketing - Eduventures Traditional Undergraduate Program Prioritization - AY 2016-2017](#)), job market data, and/or feedback from students, faculty, advisory board members, and other stakeholders. The new program review process (noted in section 1I3) formalizes an in-depth review of each program every five years.

Proposals to change or discontinue courses or programs are managed through the Academic Governance process (described in section 1P4a). Through this process, faculty and academic administration may submit proposals to the appropriate Academic Council or Board to change or discontinue courses and programs; approved measures are then moved to Academic Cabinet for review. In the case of program discontinuation recommendations, these proposals are additionally reviewed by the appropriate college Dean, VP of Academic Affairs, and President's Cabinet. The ultimate decision to approve program discontinuation lies with President's Cabinet; the Board of Trustees is also informed of program discontinuation approvals. When programs are approved for discontinuation, the appropriate faculty and college Dean will develop teach-out plans to ensure that current students have the opportunity to complete their degree in these programs.

1R3: What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution’s diverse stakeholders?

Program Additions

The University has been proactive, strategic, and responsive to stakeholder needs in the development of new programs. Since AY 2016-2017 several new programs have been launched, including the examples noted below (Table 1R3.1):

Table 1R3.1: Program Additions			
Program	Academic Year	Impetus for Addition	Additional Information
B.S. Cyber Security		Market Demand (Exhibit 1R3.1: Meeting)	Developed in partnership with McConnell Air Force Base.

M.S. Cyber Security	AY 2016-2017	<p>Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09 (Page 13)</p> <p>Launched through Revitalization and Growth Plan (Exhibit 1R3.2: Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (Page 11)).</p>	<p>Program curricula aligns with the National Security Agency Center for Academic Excellence in Cyber Defense (NSA CAE-CD).</p> <p>State-of-the-art cyber security lab built to support programs.</p> <p>Approved by Academic Cabinet on 03-09-2016 (Exhibit 1R3.3: Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09 (Page 2)).</p>
M.Ed. Special Education High Incidence Licensure	AY 2017-2018	<p>Market demand (Exhibit 1R3.4: Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-03-07 (Page 13))</p>	<p>Program licensed by Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) (Exhibit 1R3.5: KSDE - M.Ed. SPED High Incidence Approval - 2017)</p> <p>Approved by Academic Cabinet on 04-08-2018 (Exhibit 1R3.6: Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18)).</p>
M.B.A., Finance Concentration	AY 2018-2019	<p>Local business and M.B.A. Advisory Board feedback noting the need for additional finance expertise in our students.</p>	<p>Program curricula developed by faculty and M.B.A. Advisory Board and aligns with the Accreditation Council for Business Schools & Programs (ACBSP) program learning outcomes in preparation for ACBSP candidacy efforts (as detailed in section 1I4).</p> <p>Approved by Academic Cabinet on 04-19-2018 (Exhibit 1R3.7: Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2017-09-20 (Page 2)).</p>
G.M.B.A., Finance Concentration		<p>Eduventures feedback noting that most peer and aspirant M.B.A. programs include a Finance concentration.</p>	

Program Changes

The University has also been responsive to changing marketplace dynamics through material changes to existing programs, including the examples noted below (Table 1R3.2):

Program	Academic Year	Impetus for Change	Additional Information
B.A. Spanish	AY 2016-2017	Declining enrollment and job market data/projections indicating growth in translation and interpretation careers (Exhibit 1R3.8: Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-04-20 (Page 12)).	Transitioned from a traditional focus on literature to a focus on translation and interpretation. Approved by Academic Cabinet on 04-20-2016 (Exhibit 1R3.9: Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2016-04-20).
M.I.S. Management Information Systems	AY 2018-2019	Reverting back to AY 2015-2016 curriculum. Original intent in AY 2016-2017 was to update curriculum to align more closely with cyber security coursework; student feedback indicates preference for prior curriculum focus (Exhibit 1R3.10: Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18 (Page 16)).	Approved by Academic Cabinet on 04-08-2018 (Exhibit 1R3.11: Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18).

Program Discontinuations

In addition to adding or modifying programs, the University has been prudent in discontinuing programs for which there is no longer significant demand or for which we no longer have an appropriate competitive advantage, including the examples noted below (Table 1R3.3):

Program	Academic Year	Impetus for Discontinuation	Additional Information
M.B.A., Business Analytics Concentration	AY 2017-2018	Insufficient market demand.	
B.A.			

Organizational Leadership and Transformational Change	AY 2017-2018	Declining enrollment.	Reorganized as concentration within B.B.A. Business Management in AY 2018-2019.
B.A. Human Resource Management			

1I3: Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

New Program Review Process

In AY 2017-2018 a new Program Review process was developed by a team including faculty from each college and the college deans. The process includes a comprehensive 10-point review of each program, including review of mission alignment, program quality assessment, program resources, continuous improvement, and external reviewer feedback. Each program will undergo program review on a five-year cycle, affording opportunity to implement and review the impact of program changes and distribute the administrative burden (Exhibit 1I3.1: [Academic Affairs - Program Review - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Three programs piloted this program review process in AY 2017-2018: B.A. English, B.A. Criminal Justice, and B.A. Human Services-Sociology (Exhibit 1I3.2: [Academic Affairs - English Program Review - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Badge and Certificate Program Development

As noted in the newly implemented strategic plan, the University is developing several micro-credentialing opportunities to complement its traditional academic degrees, including various badge and certificate programs (Exhibit 1I3.3: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 \(Page 10\)](#); Exhibit 1I3.4: [Academic Affairs - Badges and Certificates - 2018](#)). The non-credit badges are delivered through short courses focused on specific learning outcomes and provide a way for students to verifiably share skills, talents, and accomplishments with employers. The for-credit certificates align with various business specialties and, in many cases, prepare the student to sit for professional certification exams (e.g., a Certificate in Project Management prepares a student to sit for the Project Management Professional (PMP) certification) (Exhibit 1I3.5: [PMI - Project Management Professional \(PMP\) Exam Outline - 2015](#)).

Sources

- Academic Affairs - B.A. Criminal Justice Program Review - AY 2012-2013
- Academic Affairs - Badges and Certificates - 2018
- Academic Affairs - English Program Review - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - English Program Review Evaluation - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - M.H.C.L. Program Review - AY 2012-2013

- Academic Affairs - Program Review - AY 2017-2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- KSDE - M.Ed. SPED High Incidence Approval - 2017
- Marketing - Eduventures Traditional Undergraduate Program Prioritization - AY 2016-2017
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09 (page number 13)
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-04-20
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2016-04-20 (page number 12)
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2017-09-20
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2017-09-20 (page number 2)
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-03-07
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-03-07 (page number 13)
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18
- Meeting Agenda - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18 (page number 16)
- Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09
- Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2016-03-09 (page number 2)
- Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2016-04-20
- Meeting Minutes - Academic Cabinet - 2018-04-18
- PMI - Project Management Professional (PMP) Exam Outline - 2015
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 11)
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 (page number 10)

1.4 - Academic Program Quality

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

1P4: PROCESSES

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

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

1R4: RESULTS

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

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

1I4: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

1P4a. Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)

Faculty determine the preparation required of students for the curricula, courses, and programs that they will pursue, and approve these determinations through the academic governance process. Faculty may develop proposals within their division for review and then submission to the Academic Council for their college, comprised of the college's Faculty, Dean, and other non-voting members. These bodies preside over the academic matters of the school, including receiving, reviewing, and

approving proposals for all changes to the School's academic programs. The Academic Councils submit all approved items to the Academic Cabinet, which presides over the academic governance of the entire University. The Academic Cabinet will, among other duties, formulate university-wide policies, review and approve degree requirements, and provide coordinating oversight for academic activities that impact more than one of the University's schools (Exhibit 1P4a.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 59\)](#)). Several student preparation requirements are developed through this process, including:

- Developing admission requirements by college (e.g., GPA and ACT/SAT test score requirements)
- Developing entrance requirements for specific programs (e.g., additional GPA requirements for entry into the Elementary Education program)
- Establishing interview requirements for prospective students
- Defining course prerequisites and co-requisites

All university and program preparatory requirements are communicated publicly via the University's website (Exhibit 1P4a.2: [Friends University Website - Traditional Undergraduate Requirements - 2018](#); Exhibit 1P4a.3: [Friends University Website - Adult Undergraduate Requirements - 2018](#); Exhibit 1P4a.4: [Friends University Website - Graduate Requirements - 2018](#)), within the Academic Catalog (Exhibit 1P4a.5: [Course Catalog](#)), and within program specific student handbooks. Additionally, admissions counselors, faculty and program directors, and athletic coaches are well versed in these requirements, facilitating proper advising, recruiting, and vetting of candidates. In the case of university admissions, candidates may be admitted to programs unconditionally, on probationary status, or not at all, indicating to faculty, staff, and the student the adequacy of their preparation; probationary admission status also triggers post-enrollment academic progress reporting from the Registrar's office to appropriate Faculty and academic leadership.

Course preparatory requirements are communicated publicly via the Academic Catalog and course schedule. Syllabi for each course further detail the course preparation requirements in addition to the specific curricula (e.g., course objectives and assignments) and learning (e.g., outcomes) that students will pursue.

Multiple resources are available to students who may need help preparing for an assignment, course, or program, including the Academic Resource Center, Academic Success Coaches, Career Services Office, Library, and Wellness & Counseling Services. The availability of these resources are also communicated publicly on the University website, in course syllabi, and through various other media across campus.

1P4b. Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)

Friends University offers courses through multiple modalities, including traditional courses, web-enhanced, online, blended, and synchronous electronic learning (SEL). The Faculty, Division Chairs/Program Directors, and Deans are responsible for evaluating and ensuring program rigor across these modalities. Expectations common to courses, faculty, and programs across all modalities include:

- Assessment of student learning
- Assessment of teaching effectiveness, through the administration of course evaluations to students
- Faculty maintenance of office hours (in-person and virtual)

- Inclusion in Program Review
- Publication of detailed course requirements, learning outcomes, academic policies, and student support services through standard course syllabi

Online and blended courses include additional support from the Director of Online Learning and our Learning Management System (LMS) provider, The LearningHouse. This support includes orientation training and online technology requirement detailing for students, LMS and online technology (e.g., video conferencing) training for faculty, online course design support, and 24/7 Helpdesk support. Additionally, the Academic Technology Committee, including representatives from Information Technology, Faculty, VP of Academic Affairs, and Director of Online Learning, develop academic technology plans, which include the procurement of appropriate resources to ensure adequate and equivalent student learning across modalities.

The University currently has four active, approved branch locations:

- Friends University - Master of Science in Marriage and Family Therapy - 6300 Glenwood St. #100, Overland Park, KS 66202
- Prairie Band Potawatomi Education Center - Bachelor of Business Administration in Business Management - 16281 Q Road, Mayetta, KS 66509
- Garden City Community College - Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting - 801 Campus Dr., Garden City, KS 67486
- Dillions Food Stores - Master of Business Administration and the Bachelor of Business Administration in Business Management - 2800 E. 4th Ave, Hutchinson, KS 67501

In each of these locations, the University maintains equivalent standards in evaluating and ensuring program rigor as exist on the Main Campus. Specific details highlighting our management of the programs at these facilities, including exhibits for instructor evaluation, peer review, IDEA Student Rating of Faculty Instruction Longitudinal Reports, academic dashboards, and assessment plans, are included in our most recent Multi-Location Visit Institutional Report (Exhibit 1P4b.1: [Academic Affairs - Friends University Multi-Location Visit Report - 2017](#)). Highlights include evaluation of:

- Near- and long-term branch location strategies
- Facilities, including adequacy of physical facilities and technology support
- Alignment of marketing, promotion, and enrollment with actual resources and capabilities
- Instructor qualifications and evaluation of faculty and staff performance
- Student Support Services
- Assessment of Student Learning
- Continuous Quality Improvement

Friends University has an established process for evaluating and ensuring program quality for dual-credit programs. Upon approval of every new dual-credit course the dean's office reviews the faculty credentials to ensure the instructor meets the Qualified Faculty requirements outlined by HLC. Processes for reviewing instructor qualifications for dual-credit, adjunct, and full-time faculty are detailed in section 3P1b. A course syllabus is requested with detailed information regarding outcomes, texts, assignments, and additional class requirements.

In AY 2017-2018, Friends joined an online learning consortium, the College Consortium, that allows us to share courses, credits, and tuition with other member institutions and increase retention and graduation rates by offering online courses to catch students up when they fall behind (Exhibit 1P4b.2: [Academic Affairs - College Consortium MSA - 2018](#)).

1P4c. Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)

Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) is managed through the Academic Resource Center (ARC). Petitions for credit from outside non-accredited sources are processed in accordance with guidelines established with the University Registrar, as noted in the Academic Catalog (Exhibit 1P4c.1: [Course Catalog](#)). Recommendations for the credit to be awarded are based on American Council on Education (ACE), College Credit Recommendations Service (CREDIT), or National College Credit Recommendation Service (NCCRS) guidance (Exhibit 1P4c.2: [ACE Credit Website - The National Guide to College Credit for Workforce Training - 2018](#); Exhibit 1P4c.3: [NCCRS Website - 2018](#)). Other petitions for credit are evaluated through the Life Learning Essay (LLE) process. Undergraduate students may receive up to 30 credit hours through PLA. Graduate students may receive up to 6 hours through a combination of PLA and transfer hours.

Undergraduate students may also receive credit for Credit by Examination and/or Evaluation in a variety of ways:

- College Level Examination Program (CLEP) General and Subject Examinations
- Advanced Placement (AP) Program
- DSST Exams
- Credit by Examination

A student may earn up to 60 hours in total through these processes; additional limits exist for certain exam types, as noted in the Academic Catalog (Exhibit 1P4c.1: [Course Catalog](#)). Hours earned through this process do not affect the cumulative GPA. Credit for CLEP exams are based on ACE and CREDIT guidance, and credit for DSST Exams carry their own recommendations. The Registrar and faculty work together to approve which exams satisfy learning outcomes of associated courses.

Additionally, Friends will grant 30 hours of General Education credit upon entrance to students who have successfully completed an International Baccalaureate Diploma (Exhibit 1P4c.1: [Course Catalog](#)).

The University maintains detailed policies regarding the acceptance of transfer credits from regionally accredited colleges and universities (Exhibit 1P4c.1: [Course Catalog](#)). Upon receipt of official transcripts from the transfer institution(s), the registrar's office may transfer credits, subject to the following limitations:

- Traditional undergraduate students may transfer up to 64 credit hours from 2-year institutions (pending update to 69 hours for AY 2018-2019, noted in section 1I4).
- Adult undergraduate students may transfer up to 78 credit hours from 2-year institutions (pending update to 69 hours for AY 2018-2019, noted in section 1I4).
- Graduate students may transfer up to 6 credit hours.

Credits beyond these limits may be transcribed, but will not count towards graduation. Additional conditions for transfer of credit, including course grade minimums, are detailed in the Academic Catalog.

The University also has Articulation Agreements with multiple Kansas community colleges to allow associate's degree-holders to transfer in with junior standing (Exhibit 1P4c.4: [Friends University Website - Articulation Agreements - 2018](#)). Additionally, we subscribe to the Transfer Evaluation System (TES) to help us maintain an articulation database within our Student Information System for all courses from Kansas schools.

1P4d. Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)

As of Fall 2017, nearly one third (335 of 1,056) of our full-time student population were seeking degrees from programs with specialized accreditations and/or state approvals (Table 1P4d.1). Program accreditations are sought as part of University Strategic Plans, with input from the Academic Unit in consideration, President's Cabinet, Board of Trustees, and external advisors. Considerations for pursuing specialized accreditations include Mission alignment, impact on student learning, existing and needed internal resources, benefit to the program(s), and overall benefit to the University. Friends maintains long-standing accreditations from the following bodies:

- Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE); currently in accreditation renewal process (Exhibit 1P4d.1: [COAMFTE Accreditation Listing - Friends \(Wichita\) - 2018](#); Exhibit 1P4d.2: [COAMFTE Accreditation Listing - Friends \(Kansas City\) - 2018](#)).
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP); most recently accredited in 2017; next comprehensive review in AY 2023 – 2024 (Exhibit 1P4d.3: [CAEP Accredited Provider Details - Friends University - 2018](#)).
- Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) (Exhibit 1P4d.4: [KSDE Directory App Progs Endorsements - Friends University - 2018](#)).
- National Association of Schools of Music (NASM); most recently accredited in 2012; next comprehensive review in AY 2021 – 2022 (Exhibit 1P4d.5: [NASM Accredited Institutions Search - Friends University - 2018](#)).

Accrediting Body	Degree	Major	Fall 2017 Enrollment (FT, PT, 2 nd Major, Minor)	% of Total Enrollment (FT, PT, 2 nd Major, Minor)
CAEP and KSDE	B.A.	Art Education	(6, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.S.	Elementary Education	(36, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.A.	English Language Arts Education	(8, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.S.	Math Education	(1, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.M.	Music Education	(33, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.S.	Physical Education Teacher Education	(31, 0, 0, 2)	
	B.A.	Spanish Education	(0, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.A.	Speech/Theater Education	(1, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.M.	Vocal Music Education	(2, 0, 0, 0)	

	B.S.	Elementary Education	(3, 12, 0, 0)	
	M.E.	Teaching and Learning	(0, 40, NA, NA)	
	M.E.	Special Education High Incidence (P – 12)	(14, 1, NA, NA)	
CAEP and KSDE Total			(135, 53, 0, 2)	(13%, 10%, 0%, 2%)
NASM	B.A.	Music	(11, 1, 1, 14)	
	B.M.	Music Education	(33, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.M.	Performance	(12, 0, 2, 0)	
NASM Total			(56, 1, 3, 14)	(5%, 0%, 3%, 11%)
COAMFTE	M.S.	Family Therapy	(335, 61, 2, 14)	(11%, 1%, NA, NA)
Total Specialized Accredited Programs			(335, 61, 2, 14)	(32%, 11%, 2%, 11%)

In maintaining these accreditations, we provide faculty with opportunities to excel through access to nationally adopted program learning outcomes (PLOs) and assessments, best practices in pedagogy, and currency through regularly updated accreditation standards. Students receive similar benefits and are often able to secure better job placements by graduating from a specialized accredited program.

1P4e. Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)

Each curricular program maintains learning outcomes appropriate to their discipline and degree-level, which are publicly articulated on their respective program pages of the University website. Common learning outcomes for the undergraduate General Education program are publicly articulated through our updated General Education webpages (Exhibit 1P4e.1: [Friends University Website - General Education - 2018](#)), as are various co-curricular outcomes (e.g., Residence Life, Exhibit 1P4e.2: [Friends University Website - Residence Life - 2018](#)). Additionally, course and program learning outcomes are articulated in course syllabi. These outcomes are assessed in a multitude of ways, including through capstone courses (Exhibit 1P4e.3: [Academic Affairs - CBASE Senior Capstone Courses - By Major - AY 2017-2018](#)), portfolios, and various course-embedded artifacts.

Review of program outcomes is conducted annually by faculty and the college Deans. Currently, all specialized accredited programs, adult undergraduate programs, and graduate programs as well as some traditional undergraduate programs participate in this process. Some traditional undergraduate programs have not recently participated in this process due to changes in leadership and staffing. The General Education program assesses outcomes under the new process implemented in AY 2017-2018, as described in section 1P1.

A new Program Review process was piloted by several programs in AY 2017-2018 and will be fully operational in AY 2018-2019 (Exhibit 1P4e.4: [Academic Affairs - Program Review - AY 2017-2018](#)). As part of this process, each program will conduct program outcome assessment annually, with additional program review conducted every five years (programs with Specialized Accreditations

are exempt from this process when these activities already occur within their normal programmatic accreditation efforts). The Program Review is a holistic process, including review of:

- Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan congruence
- Program requirements, demographics, market demand, and external benchmarking
- Continuous Quality Improvement
- Program quality assessment
- Program resources and budget
- Goals for improvement
- External evaluation
- Outcomes assessment

The University administers an annual survey to its graduating class to review post-graduate outcomes (e.g., employment, continuing education, and salary information) as well as to assess many formative experiences from the students' academic careers (e.g., course quality, instructor effectiveness, advising effectiveness, career services use and effectiveness, and faith). This survey instrument was significantly revised in AY 2015-2016 and again in AY 2016-2017 to capture additional information helpful in evaluating graduate success, program rigor, support service effectiveness, and alignment with the University Mission. Results are disaggregated by college, academic program/division, and gender and reviewed longitudinally to review trend data. Reporting is shared and discussed with University leadership, including Cabinet Council and the Board of Trustees; results are also shared with faculty and academic support personnel.

In preparing students for post-graduation employment, the University supports a wide array of internship opportunities for its traditional undergraduate students. Since AY 2014-2015, internships have been offered in at least 25 subject areas.

Our programs with Specialized Accreditations employ robust methods of assessing graduate outcomes attainment, including employer surveys, clinical supervisor evaluations, clinical internship evaluations, program evaluation surveys, alumni surveys, review of national exam pass rates, and review of job placement rates.

1P4f. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

Tools, methods, and instruments used to assess program rigor are selected both by faculty and through more centralized efforts that include academic committees, academic leadership, and the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation.

Our Education and Marriage and Family Therapy programs use LiveText e-portfolio system as a primary tool to collect student artifacts and assess program rigor. This system links to necessary specialized accreditation standards to aid in assessment and is also used by the education program to administer internal and external surveys; the Marriage and Family Therapy program uses Qualtrics software for its survey administrations.

Across the University, our Learning Management System has been enhanced to assess outcomes for course-embedded artifacts. Standards and outcomes from multiple external bodies (e.g., ACBSP, AAC&U CAE-CD, CAEP, KSDE, and InTASC) have been imported for program use and align to common 4-point rubric scales. Furthermore, our Program Review documents are stored in LiveText Assessment Insight System (AIS) to systematically centralize the data and promote easier and more robust reporting.

1R4: What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs?

Prior Learning and Transfer Credits

The Academic Resource Center (ARC) maintains CPL application and award data annually by college (Table 1R4.1). Additional data are tracked to identify the amount of CPL applied to required and elective courses.

Year	College	Student Count	Credits Awarded	Award Rate	Average Credits per Student
AY 2014 – 2015	Traditional Undergraduate	12	34	100%	2.8
	Adult Undergraduate	63	214	99%	3.4
	Graduate	0	0	NA	0.0
	Total	75	248	99%	3.3
AY 2015 – 2016	Traditional Undergraduate	10	59	96%	5.9
	Adult Undergraduate	45	186	100%	4.1
	Graduate	15	90	100%	6.0
	Total	70	335	99%	4.8
AY 2016 – 2017	Traditional Undergraduate	9	29	100%	3.2
	Adult Undergraduate	36	115	100%	3.2
	Graduate	3	9	100%	3.0
	Total	48	153	100%	3.2

Additionally, Friends University is a three-time recipient (2016-2018) of the Phi Theta Kappa Transfer Honor Roll Recognition, which “recognizes the importance of your institutional commitment and investment of resources to support community college transfer” (Exhibit 1R4.1: [Phi Theta Kappa Website - Transfer Honor Roll - 2018](#)). Areas of evaluation for this recognition include:

- Institutional Partnerships & Community College Collaboration

- Pre-Transfer Institutional Support: Outreach, Admissions, & Access
- Post-Transfer Student Engagement & Support
- Community College Data Tracking & Institutional Priorities
- Transfer Innovations

Program Review Pilot

In AY 2017-2018, the University piloted a new program review process with its Criminal Justice, Sociology, and English programs. The program reviews collected a plethora of internal analyses and included external review based on this data. These reviews provided valuable evidence and feedback to affirm various attributes of the program (e.g., enrollment growth and program outcomes achievement) and provide recommendations for improvements (e.g., additional resources) (Exhibit 1R4.2: [Academic Affairs - English Program Review - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 1R4.3: [Academic Affairs - English Program Review Evaluation - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Multi-Location Visit

In AY 2017-2018 Friends underwent a Multi-Location Visit on two of its four active, approved branch locations. The report indicated adequacy in all measured areas, noting in summary that “These two locations are well equipped and managed. Students, faculty, and support staff are well informed and satisfied with all levels of service. The university responds to local needs including new or repeated offerings, accessibility (face to face combined with online resources), facilities, student financial assistance, faculty support, etc.” (Exhibit 1R4.4: [Academic Affairs - Friends University Multi-Location Visit Report - 2017](#)).

Graduation Survey

AY 2016-2017 provided a second year of longitudinal data for our revised survey instrument (Exhibit 1R4.5: [Institutional Research - Graduate Survey Report - 2017](#)). A key measure of the survey is post-graduation employment, for which results were mixed. Adult students maintained similar to slightly improved rates of employment at graduation compared to the previous year; traditional undergraduates noted higher levels of unemployment at graduation compared to the previous year. With the recent completion of our Pathway to Profession initiative and accompanying four-year career planning process, we anticipate post-graduate employment outcomes for traditional undergraduates to improve (Exhibit 1R4.6: [Friends University Website - Career Services - 2018](#); Exhibit 1R4.7: [Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018](#)). Additionally, given the timing of this survey, we currently do not capture a full picture of post-graduation success relative to employment – this has been remedied through the new Program Alumni surveys administered in AY 2017-2018, which allow students to identify if they obtained employment within 3, 6, 9, and 12 months from graduation (see section 1I4).

Supporting the spiritual component of the University’s Mission statement, we added a section in the most recent survey to evaluate how well our students explored and grew in their faith as a result of their experiences at Friends. Responses indicate that student faith was most positively impacted at Friends among the traditional undergraduate students, perhaps unsurprising given the larger online

and commuting population of adult students. With that said, our Campus Ministries office will continue to review ways to increase spiritual impact of all our students.

Additional data and analysis of graduate salaries, Career Services office use and satisfaction, advising effectiveness, alumni involvement, and overall experiences at the university are detailed within the report.

Internships

As noted in section 1R1, internship participation was a key element of our Pathway to Profession initiative. Evidencing this focus, we have seen increased student participation, with between 80 and 100 internship experiences during the past two Spring and Fall semesters (Exhibit 1R1.8: [Academic Affairs - Internship Courses - 2018](#)). Likewise, student reported participation in internships or field experiences increased from 56% in the 2014 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administration to 68% in the 2017 NSSE administration.

Specialized Accredited Program Assessments

Our Education and Marriage and Family Therapy program have robust data sets indicating graduate success. National exam pass rates, licensure rates, and on-time completion rates are measured as part of their program accreditation standards, with results consistently at or above accreditation standards. The programs also track job placement rates, along with a variety of other program outcome data, in verifying the success of their graduates (Exhibit 1R4.9: [Academic Affairs - MFT Student Achievement Criteria Data - 2018](#); Exhibit 1R4.10: [COAMFTE Website - Student Achievement Criteria Data - 2018](#); Exhibit 1R4.11: [Academic Affairs - Education Dashboard - 2017](#)).

Retention and Completion Data

Retention and completion statistics have been steadily improving across the university for the past two to three years, achieving record results in many areas. Highlighting this, first-time full time undergraduate fall-to-fall retention has increased from 63% for the Fall 2015 cohort to 75% for the Fall 2016 cohort and from 65% to 70% for full-time, transfer students during that same period. Four-year completion rates for first-time, full-time undergraduate students have increased from 21% for the Fall 2011 cohort to 37% for the Fall 2013 cohort (see section 2R2 (tables 2R2.1, 2R2.2, and 2R2.3) for more detailed discussion of retention and completion). These and other success metrics are listed for all programs (including many co-curricular programs) within the bi-annual Fact Book and are helping drive positive responses to improving student retention and completion (Exhibit 1R4.12: [Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018](#)).

1I4: Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Maintaining Specialized Accreditations

Friends University is currently a member-only institution of the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) (Exhibit 1I4.1: [ACBSP Website - Educational Members - 2018 \(Page 26\)](#)). The University previously began efforts to pursue ACBSP accreditation and aligned program outcomes across the undergraduate colleges and the graduate programs affirmed the program outcomes (Exhibit 1I4.2: [Academic Affairs - Reconciliation of Business Unit Student Learning Outcomes - 2013](#)). After an initial attempt to get ACBSP accreditation, we concluded that we would not complete our review in the required period. As a result, we abandoned our candidacy status temporarily and currently have committed ourselves to align the program with ACBSP standards in the next two years. Many business program outcomes were reviewed and updated in AY 2017-2018. Now, as a key initiative of our business programs, we will seek accredited membership within ACBSP. Given Fall 2017 enrollments, this could impact nearly one third of our full-time students and three quarters of our part-time students (Table 1I4.1). When combined with existing programmatic accreditations (Table 1P4d.1), this additional accreditation could result in nearly two thirds of our full-time students and nearly 90% of our part-time students seeking degrees from specialized and state-accredited programs.

Accrediting Body	Degree	Major	Fall 2017 Enrollment (FT, PT, 2 nd Major, Minor)	% of Total Enrollment (FT, PT, 2 nd Major, Minor)
ACBSP	B.S.	Accounting	(33, 1, 6, 18)	
	B.S.	Business Administration	(63, 0, 26, 27)	
	B.S.	Computer Science & Information Systems	(28, 0, 0, 0)	
	B.S.	Finance	(16, 1, 6, 0)	
	B.S.	International Business	(11, 0, 4, 0)	
	B.S.	Marketing	(15, 0, 5, 5)	
	B.B.A.	Accounting	(19, 17, NA, NA)	
	B.B.A.	Business Management	(52, 73, NA, NA)	
	B.S.	Computer Information Systems	(19, 19, NA, NA)	
	B.S.	Cyber Security	(4, 6, NA, NA)	
	B.B.A.	Human Resource Management	(19, 20, NA, NA)	
	M.S.	Cyber Security	(0, 12, NA, NA)	

	G.M.B.A.	Global Masters of Business Administration	(2, 35, NA, NA)	
	M.B.A.	Business Administration	(10, 156, NA, NA)	
	M.H.C.L.	Health Care Leadership	(7, 33, NA, NA)	
	M.I.S.	Management Information Systems	(2, 24, NA, NA)	
	M.S.	Information Security	(2, 6, NA, NA)	
ACBSP Total			(302, 403, 47, 50)	(29%, 75%, 41%, 40%)

Transfer Credit Policy Updates

In an effort to ensure consistency between undergraduate colleges and simplify existing policies, the Registrar's office are in the process of revising our transfer credit policy. Included in the transfer credit policy changes are updates to the maximum credit hours accepted from 2-year institutions, allowing transfer of major requirements within adult undergraduate programs, and allowing the acceptance of ROTC credit (Exhibit 1I4.3: [Academic Affairs - Transfer Credit Policy Change Proposal - 2018](#)).

Program Alumni Surveys

Seeking to enhance the data available from university graduates, new program alumni surveys were developed and administered in AY 2017-2018. Relative to academic quality, both the undergraduate and graduate surveys evaluate post-graduation employment, salary, additional certifications gained, and qualitative program feedback, with the traditional undergraduate survey additionally evaluating time to initial job placement (Exhibit 1I1.4: [Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018](#); Exhibit 1I1.5 [Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - GRAD - MBA Professional Business Administration - 2018](#)).

Sources

- Academic Affairs - CBASE Senior Capstone Courses - By Major - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - College Consortium MSA - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Credit for Prior Learning Policy Change Proposal - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Education Dashboard - 2017
- Academic Affairs - English Program Review - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - English Program Review Evaluation - AY 2017-2018

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 59)
- Academic Affairs - Friends University Multi-Location Visit Report - 2017
- Academic Affairs - Internship Courses - 2018
- Academic Affairs - MFT Student Achievement Criteria Data - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Program Review - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Reconciliation of Business Unit Student Learning Outcomes - 2013
- Academic Affairs - Transfer Credit Policy Change Proposal - 2018
- ACBSP Website - Educational Members - 2018
- ACBSP Website - Educational Members - 2018 (page number 26)
- ACE Credit Website - The National Guide to College Credit for Workforce Training - 2018
- CAEP Accredited Provider Details - Friends University - 2018
- COAMFTE Accreditation Listing - Friends (Kansas City) - 2018
- COAMFTE Accreditation Listing - Friends (Wichita) - 2018
- COAMFTE Website - Student Achievement Criteria Data - 2018
- Friends University Website - Adult Undergraduate Requirements - 2018
- Friends University Website - Articulation Agreements - 2018
- Friends University Website - Career Services - 2018
- Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018
- Friends University Website - General Education - 2018
- Friends University Website - Graduate Requirements - 2018
- Friends University Website - Residence Life - 2018
- Friends University Website - Traditional Undergraduate Requirements - 2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- Institutional Research - Graduate Survey Report - 2017
- Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - CAPS - BBA Business Management - 2018
- Institutional Research - Program Alumni Survey - GRAD - MBA Professional Business Administration - 2018
- Institutional Research - Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey Template - 2018
- KSDE Directory App Progs Endorsements - Friends University - 2018
- NASM Accredited Institutions Search - Friends University - 2018
- NCCRS Website - 2018
- Phi Theta Kappa Website - Transfer Honor Roll - 2018

1.5 - Academic Integrity

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

1P5: PROCESSES

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

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

1R5: RESULTS

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

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

1I5: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

1P5a. Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)

Friends University is committed to freedom of expression, including academic freedom, as explained by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). This commitment was reaffirmed by the General Faculty in 2014 and includes freedom in research and publication, in the classroom, and as citizens, as detailed in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 1P5a.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 46\)](#)).

Similarly, the University is committed to the principles of honesty, fairness, and respect for others. The University has an Academic Honor Code Policy, which includes a description of the Academic

Integrity process and the Definitions of Academic Dishonesty. These items are listed within the Academic Catalog, included within each course syllabus, and reviewed by faculty with students at the beginning of each term/semester (Exhibit 1P5a.2: [Course Catalog](#)). The process is reviewed annually during General Faculty meetings to ensure currency.

These policies and practices are also reinforced by the staff from our Library and Academic Resource Center (ARC). Members of these departments are versed in the Academic Honor Code and Academic Integrity Process and offer many services and resources to help students maintain compliance with these policies (e.g., writing assistance, APA writing format and citation instruction, anti-plagiarism training, and information literacy instruction). These and other services and resources are available at no charge to all students, both in-person and virtually (e.g., via email, phone, and video conferencing).

1P5b. Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

As noted in section 1P5a, students are made aware of our Academic Honor Code and Academic Integrity Process in multiple ways. The Academic Honor Code Policy provides detailed guidance to students, including types of Honor Code violations (e.g., cheating, plagiarism, fabrication), the Academic Integrity Process (i.e., the process initiated once a Faculty member determines a violation of the Honor Code has occurred), types of sanctions, hearing procedures, and the specific appeals process for the student. Multiple groups are included in the overall processes to ensure fairness and transparency:

- The Registrar's office maintains record of all Honor Code violations and advises if the student has prior documented violations
- For first-time offenders, the Division Chair/Program Director serve as initial arbiters if the student wishes to appeal the charges and/or sanctions levied by the Faculty member; if the matter remains unresolved, the Dean and ultimately the Academic Integrity Board (comprised of one Faculty member elected from each college, one Faculty Senate representative, and a representative from the Registrar's office) will provide adjudication on the matter
- For students with prior violations, the matter is referred directly to the Academic Integrity Board for review and sanctioning
- If requested by the student, judgements may be appealed to the VP of Academic Affairs, who, in conjunction with the President, will render final judgement on the matter

The University also maintains an Institutional Review Board (IRB), comprised of five University members, appointed by the VP of Academic Affairs, with recommendations from the Faculty Senate, to review all Friends University student, faculty, courses, and administrative research proposals involving human beings as research participants. The IRB's function is to be sure that the projects conform to appropriate ethical standards, to assure that participants in this research are protected, and that the University is in compliance with federal requirements. Research proposals falling within this scope will be submitted to the IRB and, depending on the design of the project, be granted exemption from IRB review, expedited review, or full review. Members of the IRB will review the proposal, with chief considerations for the protection of human participants and the benefit of the research, subsequently determining whether or not the research proposal will be approved. This policy also applies to research conducted at other institutions by Friends faculty, staff, and students, even if the other institution has its own review process (Exhibit 1P5b.1: [Academic Affairs - IRB Guidelines and Application - 2009](#)).

1P5c. Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

As noted in section 1P5b, the IRB maintains authority to approve or reject all faculty and course

research proposals involving human beings as research participants. Faculty are subject to the same research proposal approval guidelines and processes as students.

The University has EEO, Title IV, FERPA and Title IX Coordinators and provides training regarding policies and reporting requirements. Annual Title IX training is required for all Faculty (in addition to Staff and Administrators).

Standards for effective teaching, scholarship, service, and continuous professional improvement are detailed in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 1Pc.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 23\)](#)). These expectations direct our faculty to a continuous effort, both shared and individual, toward defining, researching, measuring, and improving the quality of the learning environment offered to students.

Many of our Faculty also adhere to external ethical practice guidelines more specific to their discipline. Our Faculty Handbook notes expectations of Faculty teaching in the M.S. in Family Therapy program (Exhibit 1Pc.2: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 23\)](#)), noting responsibilities governed by specific legal and ethical requirements for licensed mental health professionals and COAMFTE specialized accreditation standards). Faculty in this and other accredited programs abide various codes of conduct/ethics:

- Education, accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), adheres to the CAEP Code of Conduct (Exhibit 1P5c.3: [CAEP Code of Conduct - 2018](#))
- Family Therapy, accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE), adheres to the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) Code of Ethics (Exhibit 1P5c.4: [AAMFT - Code of Ethics - 2015](#))
- Music, accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), adheres to the NASM code of Ethics (Exhibit 1P5c.5: [NASM Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 29\)](#))

Faculty maintaining external credentials and/or licensure may also have added discipline-specific ethical guidelines and annual continuing education requirements in ethics, such as:

- Certified Public Accountants (CPA) adhere to the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) Code of Professional Conduct (Exhibit 1P5c.6: [AICPA - Code of Professional Conduct - 2016](#)) and Kansas Board of Accountancy (KSBOA) Code of Professional Conduct (Exhibit 1P5c.7: [KSBOA - Code of Professional Conduct - 2018](#)) and must complete two hours of ethics training bi-annually to maintain certification (Exhibit 1P5c.8: [KSBOA - Continuing Education Requirements - 2018](#))
- Certified Management Accountants (CMA) adhere to the Institute of Management Accountants (IMA) Statement of Ethical Professional Practice and must complete two hours of ethics training annually to maintain certification (Exhibit 1P5c.9: [IMA - Continuing Education Requirements and Rules - 2018](#))

1P5d. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

The University subscribes to the plagiarism-detection service, TurnItIn, as an integrated add-on module to our Learning Management System. This software allows student work to be reviewed for plagiarism and originality against a repository of previously stored coursework, the internet, and a vast array of journals, periodicals, and publications. Papers are scored for similarity against these

sources, with passages highlighted and linked to suspected source material, providing the instructor with a quick initial indication of potential plagiarism and direct evidence from which to better-substantiate charges of Honor Code violations.

Records of Honor Code violations are stored within our Student Information System, facilitating identification of repeat offenders and review of longitudinal trends. Student work and Academic Misconduct Incident Reports are stored by the Registrar’s office (Exhibit 1P5d.1: [Academic Affairs - Academic Misconduct Incident Report and Procedure - 2018](#)). Additionally, the Registrar’s office provides guidance on measures to prevent Academic Dishonesty (Exhibit 1P5d.2: [Academic Affairs - Academic Integrity Faculty Preventative Measures - 2018](#)).

1R5: What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity?

The Registrar’s office tracks and manages academic integrity violations; similarly, the IRB tracks and manages research violations (Table 1R5.1).

Table 1R5.1: Academic Integrity and Institutional Review Board Violations		
	AY 2016 - 2017	AY 2017-2018
Academic Integrity - Cheating	2	1
Academic Integrity - Plagiarism	19	5
Institutional Review Board	0	0

1I5: Based on 1R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

IRB Guideline Updates

The Friends University IRB is in the process of updating its guidelines and application form and making this information more accessible to faculty and students (Exhibit 1I5.1: [Academic Affairs - IRB Guidelines and Application Proposed Policy Change - 2018](#)). These updates will allow the IRB process and forms to more closely conform to the federal guidelines on the Office for Human Research Protections website (hhs.gov), which were reviewed and updated in 2016. The IRB also monitors the IRB forum, which provides daily updates regarding questions and concerns raised by other researchers from institutions around the world.

Education Preparation Program Instrument Enhancement

The Education department is currently in the process of revising its student-teacher dispositions forms and unit assessment instruments, in response to CAEP feedback. These updates will seek to improve content validity and better align with InTASC standards.

Academic Integrity Support

We have also invested in new training to support Academic Integrity. Our Director of Online Learning has developed new training materials for the TurnItIn software and presented on best-practices at Faculty Retreat and Adjunct training sessions. Additionally, our Library Staff have developed new training materials for faculty and students on information literacy and have partnered with faculty teaching our Friends Experience freshman seminar to embed this information in that course.

Sources

- AAMFT - Code of Ethics - 2015
- Academic Affairs - Academic Integrity Faculty Preventative Measures - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Academic Misconduct Incident Report and Procedure - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 23)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 46)
- Academic Affairs - IRB Guidelines and Application - 2009
- Academic Affairs - IRB Guidelines and Application Proposed Policy Change - 2018
- AICPA - Code of Professional Conduct - 2016
- CAEP Code of Conduct - 2018
- IMA - Continuing Education Requirements and Rules - 2018
- KSBOA - Code of Professional Conduct - 2018
- KSBOA - Continuing Education Requirements - 2018
- NASM Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- NASM Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 29)

2 - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

2.1 - Current and Prospective Student Need

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

2P1: PROCESSES

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

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

2R1: RESULTS

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

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

2I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the

next one to three years?

Responses

2P1a. Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)

Friends University begins the process of identifying underprepared and at-risk students through the admissions process. The institution has clear admissions standards outlined by college and, in some cases, by academic program, including minimum thresholds for high school GPA, transfer school GPA, GED exam score, ACT/SAT entrance exam score, and/or TOEFL exam score. Students who do not meet the full academic standards for admission may be admitted conditionally/provisionally and will be referred for appropriate assistance and other academic and student support services, which may include registration in a study skills course (Exhibit 2P1a.1: [Course Catalog](#)).

The University administers the CIRP Freshman Survey annually to incoming traditional undergraduate freshmen during orientation. Information from this survey is compared against peer school responses and used to gauge student preparedness for college, among other things (Exhibit 2P1a.2: [Institutional Research - CIRP Freshman Survey - 2017](#)). These data help identify academic support needs such as study skills enhancement and remedial coursework, ultimately influencing student support materials and programming.

The institution has also identified characteristics of students who are historically less likely to be successful and routinely develops programs or services to promote their success (e.g., development of a first-generation student retention program for AY 2018-2019, noted in Table 1P3a.1).

2P1b. Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)

New students to the university are required to complete new student orientations to acclimate them to the university and make them aware of the various academic support services available to help them throughout their university experience (Exhibit 2P1b.1: [Friends University Website - New Student Transition Programs - 2018](#)).

When first registering for courses at the university, students are initially placed into appropriate English and Math courses based on ACT/SAT exam scores (Exhibit 2P1b.2: [Academic Affairs - English Math Placement - AY 2017-2018](#)). Course prerequisites and co-requisites also serve to ensure that students are placed into courses in which they can be successful. Additionally, traditional and adult undergraduate students are required to take introductory courses during their first semester as part of the General Education Program that are tailored to address the different learning and professional development needs of these groups.

Faculty in traditional undergraduate programs are required to submit mid-term grades for all students (at a minimum, identifying grades as passing, D, or F) to aid in academic counseling and provide students with information to enact corrective actions for the remainder of the semester, as necessary (Exhibit 2P1b.3: [Course Catalog](#)).

The University also has a study hall program for student-athletes, requiring these students to complete 10 hours per week of academic work/studying in the Library and/or Academic Resource Center. New freshman must participate for 2 semesters, new transfers for 1 semester, and upper class students

whose CGPA is below 2.5 must participate until they raise their CGPA to at or above 2.5.

2P1c. Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)

Expectations for faculty availability to students are clearly articulated through the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 2P1c.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 21\)](#)). Faculty are expected to maintain a minimum of 10 office hours per week at an appropriate location approved by the Dean and at times appropriate for the student demographic being served (including virtually via Zoom teleconferencing); office hour expectations are also noted for adjunct faculty (Exhibit 2P1c.2: [Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 15\)](#)). These office hours must be posted publicly as well as being noted in the course syllabi. Adjunct faculty are also expected to respond to student questions and concerns within 24 hours.

Additionally, faculty must advise and mentor a minimum of 10 students. Faculty are not only expected to advise students academically and professionally, but must also be familiar with and assist students in accessing student support services (Exhibit 2P1c.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 21\)](#)). The Fall Faculty Retreat provides an opportunity for faculty to meet with support staff to review services provided and feedback on individual students.

2P1d. Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)

The University offers a wide array of academic support services, including: academic advising and academic success coaches (ASCs), the Academic Resource Center (ARC), ADA services, career services, library services, and other physical resources.

All students are assigned a faculty advisor or ASC through the duration of their academic career. Responsibilities for the advisors and ASCs include:

- Communicating the curriculum, requirements, and academic policies and procedures
- Helping develop educational plans
- Providing information about campus resources and services
- Monitoring progress toward meeting educational goals

Additionally, faculty advisors can assist in developing professional experiences and networking (e.g., internships and job shadowing) (Exhibit 2P1d.1: [Friends University Website - Academic Advising - 2018](#); Exhibit 2P1d.2: [Friends University Website - Success Coaches - 2018](#)).

The ARC offers tutoring, writing, and exam preparation services to all students at no additional cost. Both one-on-one and group sessions are available as well as in person or virtual services (e.g., via email or video conferencing) to assist residential, commuter, and distance learners. Tutoring disciplines include writing, mathematics & statistics, natural sciences, computer sciences, music theory, accounting & finance, and foreign languages. The ARC maintains a variety of resources for writing, research, and documentation styles (Exhibit 2P1d.3: [Friends University Website - Academic Resource Center - 2018](#)). The ARC is certified by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) and its peer tutors are trained following CRLA guidelines (Exhibit 2P1d.4: [Academic Affairs - ARC CRLA Certification - 2018](#)). Additionally, the ARC manages the University's disability services, assisting students in their request for accommodations and helping them obtain necessary support services (Exhibit 2P1d.5: [Academic Affairs - ADA Services Policy - 2017](#)).

The Career Services Office (CSO) offers a variety of services to help students prepare for careers or,

for adult students, helping them advance in their current careers or transition into new careers. With programming available beginning in the students' first year, the CSO helps students with career planning (e.g., career counseling and assessments), career preparation (e.g., resume writing and interview preparation), and internship and job search assistance (Exhibit 2P1d.6: [Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018](#)). The CSO also manages several events throughout the year to foster career development, including career fairs, interview days, and dress-for-success events.

The Library has a plethora of resources and services available to residential and distance learner students including physical and electronic books, journals, media, databases, an interlibrary loan service, computer labs, and a monthly informational newsletter. The library also hosts many events including a monthly speaker series, Those Who Lead, Read, engaging students in discussion of literacy and leadership. Its staff help guide our student body in proper research methods and partner with our faculty to promote information literacy. The library also houses two special collections that celebrate our heritage and are available for research: The Quaker Collection and the Friends University Archives.

The university maintains additional resources to support learning needs including natural science laboratories, a Zoo Science animal care room, fine arts practice and performance spaces, computer labs, a cyber-security lab, wireless internet throughout the campus and residences, and virtual labs available within online courses.

2P1e. Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Several areas within the university maintain responsibility for targeting new student groups for educational offerings and services, including: student support service departments (e.g., the ARC), President's Cabinet and Cabinet Council, Program Advisory Boards, and various committees (e.g., the Retention and Completion Committee). In determining target groups, Friends uses a variety of responsive data sets to determine what student groups may need additional services (e.g., CIRP, SSI, NSSE, IDEA, graduation, and alumni surveys, student and course grades, and retention and completion data from the Fact Book). These measures also allow the University to improve existing services and meet changing student needs. Additionally, Friends employs several proactive measures to identify new student groups to be targeted for offerings (e.g., employment projections and high school graduate projections). These data sets help the University better understand shifting demographics that it will likely serve in the future and align strategic priorities appropriately. As example, in AY 2017-2018 Friends began offering military discounts for students enrolling in our Cyber Security programs.

2P1f. Meeting changing student needs

The University employs a variety of resources to identify student needs and adjust programming responses as these needs change. Shifts in internal demographics (e.g., the enrollment of more distance learners) help drive resource allocations. Changes in new student college preparedness (e.g., as identified through CIRP freshman surveys and other environmental scans) impact orientation and first-year student programs. Changes in student satisfaction and the importance of such items (e.g., as identified through Student Satisfaction Inventories and Adult Student Priorities Surveys) impact focus on and development of various student support services. Furthermore, changing workforce dynamics (e.g., as identified through internal and external analysis of labor statistics) impact the development of new degrees and changes to existing degree.

2P1g. Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors,

commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)

The University maintains distinct colleges for traditional undergraduate students and adult undergraduate students, allowing faculty and support staff to develop programming specific to the needs of these groups. Adult courses are typically scheduled in the evenings to accommodate working professionals; those taking evening courses on campus have access to OASIS, a staffed university space offering food and beverages, computers, printers, office supplies, and other amenities supporting the needs of evening students

The University's proportion of distance learning students has grown in recent years, particularly in the adult programs, and it makes every effort to ensure that they have the same support services available to them as residential/commuter students. Support services noted in 2P1d (i.e., academic advising and success coaches, the ARC, ADA services, career services, and library services) are all accessible virtually to distance learners; orientation sessions are also provided virtually. In AY 2017-2018 the University also invested in teleconferencing software, Zoom, to enhance the ability of all students to interact with faculty, support staff, and other students.

The University supports active military and veterans in numerous ways. Friends provides these students with enhanced affordability as members of the Yellow Ribbon Program and Department of Defense Tuition Assistance Program as well as by offering tuition discounts. The University offers college credit for military training, honorable discharge, and DSST exams. Friends also has a dedicated Veterans Affairs School Certifying Officer to assist these students with registration and financial aid questions (Exhibit 2P1g.1: [Friends University Website - Veterans - 2018](#)).

Highly motivated and academically inclined students may apply to the University Honors Program. This program exposes students to enhanced opportunities to pursue academic excellence, interdisciplinary inquiry, and personal and social awareness and responsibility. Students will also complete a research project and presentation during their senior year as part of the Honors Program (Exhibit 2P1g.2: [Friends University Website - Honors Program - 2018](#)).

2P1h. Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)

As noted in 2P1b, students complete new student orientations, which also acclimates them to various non-academic support services in addition to academic support services.

The University offers a bevy of wellness and counseling services for our students. The Friends University Counseling Office provides all students with free, anonymous online mental health screenings (Exhibit 2P1h.1: [Friends University Website - Anonymous Mental Health Screening - 2018](#)). The Counseling Office also provides free, confidential counseling sessions in our Casado Campus Center for depression, anxiety, stress management, anger problems, adjustment, and other issues as well as free workshops on topics such as test anxiety, stress management and suicide awareness (Exhibit 2P1h.2: [Friends University Website - Wellness & Counseling - 2018](#)). Further counseling services are offered to students and within the Wichita community by Center on Family Living (CFL), staffed by graduate student interns in the Marriage and Family Therapy program (Exhibit 2P1h.3: [Friends University Website - Center on Family Living Brochure - 2018](#)). The University also has a Student of Concern program, led by the VP of Student Affairs, that helps identify students who appear to be troubled and intervene before the situation reaches a crisis level (Exhibit 2P1h.4: [Friends University Website - Student of Concern - 2018](#)).

The University offers various spiritual support services through the Campus Ministries department. Students are able to find spiritual fellowship through our Cornerstone worship services, weekly

Chapel services, and Bible studies groups. Students may receive individual pastoral care from the Campus Pastor and Campus Ministries Staff (Exhibit 2P1h.5: [Friends University Website - Campus Ministries - 2018](#)). The Campus Pastor also maintains a Benevolence Fund to be used for student emergencies. Students also serve as Spiritual Life Advisors (SLA) for residential students and chaplains for athletics teams, providing spiritual guidance to these student groups.

The Office of Online Learning provides support to students engaged in online learning. Services provided include training and support for our Learning Management System, online learning tools (e.g., teleconferencing), and ancillary education software (e.g., McGraw-Hill Connect).

Financial Aid and Student Account Services are available to all students to ensure that they understand the financial aid process and their eligibility, optimize their financial aid packages, and arrange payments for any charges incurred by the University (Exhibit 2P1h.6: [Friends University Website - Financial Aid - 2018](#); Exhibit 2P1h.7: [Student Handbook](#)).

Additionally, the International Service Office (ISO) provides support to Friends University students who are on an F-1 Student visa (Exhibit 2P1h.8: [Friends University Website - International Students - 2018](#)). Services provided by the ISO include: international student-specific orientation, cultural transitioning, immigration regulations/advising, university procedures, and social and educational programming (Exhibit 2P1h.9: [Student Affairs - International Student Handbook - AY 2017-2018](#)). These processes not only assist in managing the various administrative components of international student study, but also greatly enrich the experience and cultural immersion of these students.

2P1i. Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)

The hiring process serves as the initial step to ensure that staff providing non-academic support services are appropriately qualified. Degree, licensure, and experience requirements are posted appropriate to each position and confirmed in the hiring process, ensuring that only qualified candidates are selected for these positions; each new hire must also undergo a background check. Functional training and support are provided by each department, with specific details noted below (additional leadership training is noted in section 4P3g).

Graduate student interns providing counseling services through the CFL are all advanced-stage graduate students, practicing under the supervision of clinical faculty who are either approved supervisors or approved supervisors-in training with the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

Our Financial Aid Office maintains memberships in the Kansas Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (KASFAA), Rocky Mountain Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (RMASFAA), and National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). Through these memberships, the staff receive continuing education through annual conference participation (KASFAA and RMASFAA) and professional credentialing through NASFAA.

Our Director of Counseling, Wellness, and International Services maintains LSCSW licensure, receives at least 40 hours of continuing education as part of her licensure requirement, and attends annual conferences for further continuing education. Additionally, she is a member of the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD) and National Association for International Educators (NAIE).

The Campus Ministries Office provides ongoing training for the SLAs and team chaplains.

Additionally, access to CCCU, KICA, CIC, NACUBO, and NetVue Affinity Groups is available to provide professional resources, references, training, and counsel.

2P1j. Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)

Non-academic supports services are articulated through the University website, during Enrollment Day and New Student Orientation, within syllabi, on flyers/pamphlets/brochures located throughout campus, and through on-campus mailings to student residences. Non-academic support staff also provide awareness of services to faculty, staff, and students during faculty retreat, various meetings, and in certain classes (e.g., Friends Experience new student seminar) throughout the year. These and other support services are also articulated in the New Student Guide (Exhibit 2P1j.1: [Student Affairs - New Student Guide - AY 2017-2018](#)) and Student Handbook (Exhibit 2P1j.2: [Student Handbook](#)).

2P1k. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs

Tools, methods, and instruments to assess student needs are selected at both University and program levels. From a University perspective, The Director of Institutional Research, in conjunction with academic leadership will indirectly assess student needs through the administration of nationally normed surveys (e.g., NSSE and SSI) as well as internally developed instruments (e.g., graduation and alumni surveys). Individual support programs conduct their own assessments of student needs, often in the form of internally developed survey instruments.

2P1l. Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

The University assesses the degree to which student needs are met through multiple methods and instruments, including (Table 2P1l.1):

Table 2P1l.1: Assessment of Student Needs	
Assessment Method / Instrument	Use
Retention and Graduation Data (Fact Book)	These data are produced by the Director of Institutional Research; results are distributed to administration, faculty, and staff through the bi-annual Fact Book. Data are disaggregated in multiple ways for use by constituents across campus to evaluate student success.
Student Satisfaction and Engagement data (SSI, ASPS, NSSE)	These surveys are administered by the Director of Institutional Research on three-year rotational cycles; results are distributed to administration, faculty, and staff and disaggregated in multiple ways to evaluate how effectively we satisfy student needs and achieve student engagement.

Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction (IDEA)	These surveys are administered by the Academic Affairs office at the end of each academic term; results are distributed to administration, faculty, and staff through web portals and internally developed reports and disaggregated in multiple ways to assess the effectiveness of faculty instruction.
Alumni Survey Data	These surveys are administered annually by individual programs as well as the Director of Institutional Research; results are distributed to administration, faculty, and staff and disaggregated in multiple ways to evaluate how effectively we meet students' curricular, co-curricular, and post-graduation outcomes.
Licensure and National Exam Pass Rates	These data are collected annually by various programs; results are distributed to administration and faculty and help evaluate how effectively we address student learning outcomes.
Program and Departmental Surveys	These data are collected annually by various programs; results are distributed to administration and faculty and help evaluate how effectively we address student learning outcomes.
Employer and Community Feedback	These data are collected periodically by Career Services, faculty, and administrators through various events (e.g., career fairs, community events, and specific business partner meetings); results are distributed to administration, faculty, and staff and help evaluate how effectively we prepare students for the workforce and help determine what specific needs employers have.

2R1: What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met?

Retention and Graduation Rates

Retention and graduation rates are a key indicator of how well the University meets student needs and are used across the campus by faculty and staff to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. As discussed more extensively in section 2.2, recent trends indicate improvements across all colleges and multiple subsets of the student population (e.g., first-time freshmen, transfer students, athletes, first-generation students, and minorities) (Exhibit 2R1.1: [Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018](#)).

Academic Resource Center (ARC)

The ARC routinely measures both student satisfaction through surveys administered to all students who use their services each semester, addressing satisfaction with the tutoring staff, accomplishment of tutoring outcomes, and satisfaction with the ARC environment. Results in all areas consistently demonstrate that students are satisfied and achieving favorable outcomes through use of ARC services (Exhibit 2R1.2: [Academic Affairs - Academic Resource Center Survey Data - AY 2015-2017](#)).

The ARC also routinely measures usage, which is segmented in multiple ways including by service offered, by class/discipline reviewed during tutoring, and by time and duration of visit (Exhibit 2R1.3: [Academic Affairs - Academic Resource Center Monthly Report - November 2017](#)). Such metrics allow the ARC to hire and schedule employees to most appropriately address the tutoring needs of the students. Overall usage rates have increased over the prior AY and historical averages. This, when analyzed in conjunction with positive student satisfaction ratings, indicate that students value ARC services, the University is improving awareness of ARC services, and moving the physical location of the ARC in AY 2017-2018 from the Davis Administration building to the Library beneficial.

IDEA Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction

IDEA data are used to assess many facets of teacher effectiveness, including faculty availability. In particular, IDEA scores have consistently indicated that faculty frequently (4) to almost always (5) encourage student-faculty interaction outside of class (Table 2R1.1). Disaggregation by college, modality, and faculty type (full-time vs. adjunct) yield similar results; the slight dip in ratings in Fall 2016 coincides with a transition to online survey administration and decline in response rates (Exhibit 2R1.4: [Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017 \(Page 6\)](#)).

Table 2R1.1: IDEA Teaching Methods Results - Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)

	2014		2015		2016			2017			Total
	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP	SU	FA	SP	SU	FA	
Mean Course Score	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Standard Deviation	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
Students Rating 4 or 5	75%	77%	79%	79%	79%	80%	75%	73%	77%	73%	76%
Students Rating 1 or 2	11%	10%	9%	9%	10%	10%	12%	13%	9%	13%	11%

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

NSSE Engagement Indicators assess a variety of measures associated with meeting student needs, including Student-Faculty Interaction (addressing faculty availability for student inquiry) and Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment (addressing academic and non-academic support services). Data from the 2017 administration (Exhibit 2R1.5: [Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2017 \(Page 3\)](#)) and 2014 administration (Exhibit 2R1.6: [Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2014 \(Page 3\)](#)) indicate:

- Improved ratings in Student-Faculty Interaction for both first-year students and seniors (comparable to peer sets in 2017), affirming the increased awareness in this area
- Consistent ratings in Quality of Interactions for both first-year students and seniors (comparable to peer sets in both administrations), driven by strong interactions with academic and non-academic support staff

- Lower ratings in Supportive Environment for first-year students and consistent ratings for senior students (comparable to peer sets in both administrations), proving a few opportunities for improvement, but with areas more directly related to academic and non-academic support services aligning with peer ratings

Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS)

The SSI and ASPS provide multiple feedback points to assess our academic and non-academic support services, including Academic Advising, Recruitment and Financial Aid, and Campus Support Services (Table 2R1.2). Data from the 2016 administrations (Exhibit 2R1.7: [Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2016 \(Page 7\)](#); Exhibit 2R1.8: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(CAPS\) - 2016 \(Page 6\)](#); Exhibit 2R1.9: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(GRAD\) - 2016 \(Page 6\)](#)) and 2012 administrations (Exhibit 2R1.10: [Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2012 \(Page 6\)](#); Exhibit 2R1.11: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(CAPS\) - 2012 \(Page 5\)](#); Exhibit 2R1.12: [Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey \(GRAD\) - 2012 \(Page 6\)](#)) indicate:

- Friends University student Importance in all colleges has increased between 2012 and 2016 for the below measures; satisfaction has increased by an even greater amount, indicating progress in meeting student expectations in these areas
- The mean difference between the Friends performance gap and National Four-Year Private Institutions has improved in all colleges for the below measures, indicating favorable comparability of these services

	College	Year	Friends University			National Four-Year Privates			Mean Difference
			Importance	Satisfaction / SD	GAP	Importance	Satisfaction / SD	GAP	
Academic Advising	Traditional Undergraduate	2016	6.43	5.98 / 1.11	0.45	6.35	5.58 / 1.28	0.77	0.44***
		2012	6.39	5.87 / 1.00	0.52	6.34	5.52 / 1.25	0.82	0.35***
	Adult Undergraduate	2016	6.47	5.97 / 1.18	0.50	6.51	5.87 / 1.18	0.64	0.10
		2012	6.31	5.40 / 1.20	0.91	6.45	5.62 / 1.23	0.83	-0.22**
	Graduate	2016	6.52	6.21 / 0.85	0.31	6.51	5.87 / 1.18	0.64	0.34*
		2012	6.25	5.80 / 1.04	0.45	6.45	5.62 / 1.23	0.83	0.18**
Recruitment (Admissions) and Financial Aid	Traditional Undergraduate	2016	6.24	5.66 / 1.03	0.58	6.22	5.20 / 1.25	1.02	0.46***
		2012	6.17	5.41 / 1.06	0.76	6.2	5.12 / 1.22	1.10	0.29***
	Adult Undergraduate	2016	6.38	5.99 / 0.87	0.39	6.42	5.62 / 1.26	0.80	0.24
		2012	6.28	5.59 / 1.06	0.69	6.34	5.42 / 1.25	0.92	0.17**
	Graduate	2016	6.42	6.12 / 0.87	0.30	6.42	5.62 / 1.26	0.80	0.49***
		2012	6.16	5.66 / 1.05	0.50	6.34	5.42 / 1.25	0.92	0.24***

Campus Support Services	Traditional Undergraduate	2016	6.01	5.85 / 0.92	0.16	6.04	5.53 / 1.06	0.51	0.32***
		2012	5.96	5.59 / 0.91	0.37	6.06	5.46 / 1.02	0.60	0.13**
*, **, *** Difference statistically significant at the .05, .01, and .001 levels, respectively									

Student-Athlete Study Hall

Study hall attendance is measured through student log-in/log-out activity. To analyze study hall effectiveness, weekly averages of attendance by Freshmen are segmented into average study hour quartiles and compared with average differences between high school GPA and first-semester college GPA as well as fall-to-spring retention rates. Data between the Fall 2013 and Fall 2016 cohorts indicate favorable correlations between study hour attendance and high school-to-college GPA change and retention (Exhibit 2R1.13: [Academic Affairs - Study Hall Data - AY 2013-2016](#)).

2I1: Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Academic Advising Training

In AY 2017-2018 the University launched a new annual academic advising seminar for faculty. This three-part series reviewed advising topics including:

- Academic policies
- Advising technologies
- Course schedule development
- Early Alert process (Exhibit 2I1.1: [Academic Affairs - Early Alert Process and Procedures - AY 2017-2018](#))
- Value of academic advising

Career Services Handshake Software Implementation

In AY 2018-2019, the Career Services Office is implementing a new career center management system, Handshake. This tool will expand the job and internship postings available to students, provide new first destination survey tools, and enhance analytical and reporting capabilities.

Academic Resource Center Supplemental Instruction Program

In AY 2017-2018, the ARC launched a Supplemental Instruction (SI) program, based on the national model developed at UMKC, which uses peer-assisted study sessions to improve student retention and success within targeted historically difficult courses (defined internally as traditionally high-enrollment, high “D, F, WD” rate courses). In Spring 2018, the ARC offered SI for Biology 101-

Cellular and Molecular Biology, a required course for Natural Science majors; in Fall 2018, it will add offerings for Biology 102-Biological Diversity and Design, a required course for most Natural Science majors, and Business 330-Principles of Management, a required course for Business and Information Technology majors.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Academic Resource Center Monthly Report - November 2017
- Academic Affairs - Academic Resource Center Survey Data - AY 2015-2017
- Academic Affairs - ADA Services Policy - 2017
- Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 15)
- Academic Affairs - ARC CRLA Certification - 2018
- Academic Affairs - Early Alert Process and Procedures - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - English Math Placement - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 21)
- Academic Affairs - Study Hall Data - AY 2013-2016
- Friends University Website - Academic Advising - 2018
- Friends University Website - Academic Resource Center - 2018
- Friends University Website - Anonymous Mental Health Screening - 2018
- Friends University Website - Campus Ministries - 2018
- Friends University Website - Career Services - 2018
- Friends University Website - Center on Family Living Brochure - 2018
- Friends University Website - Financial Aid - 2018
- Friends University Website - Four-Year Career Plan Undergraduate - 2018
- Friends University Website - Honors Program - 2018
- Friends University Website - International Students - 2018
- Friends University Website - New Student Transition Programs - 2018
- Friends University Website - Student of Concern - 2018
- Friends University Website - Success Coaches - 2018
- Friends University Website - Veterans - 2018
- Friends University Website - Wellness & Counseling - 2018
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2012
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2012 (page number 5)
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2016
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (CAPS) - 2016 (page number 6)
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2012
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2012 (page number 6)
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2016
- Institutional Research - Adult Student Priorities Survey (GRAD) - 2016 (page number 6)
- Institutional Research - CIRP Freshman Survey - 2017
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017
- Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017 (page number 6)
- Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2014
- Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2014 (page number 3)
- Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2017
- Institutional Research - NSSE Engagement Indicators - 2017 (page number 3)

- Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2012
- Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2012 (page number 6)
- Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2016
- Institutional Research - Student Satisfaction Inventory - 2016 (page number 7)
- Student Affairs - International Student Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Student Affairs - New Student Guide - AY 2017-2018

2.2 - Retention, Persistence, and Completion

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

2P2: PROCESSES

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

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

2R2: RESULTS

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

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

2I2: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

2P2a. Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)

Retention, persistence, and completion data are some of the key data sets used across the University to measure the health of curricular and co-curricular programs. The Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation manages the collection of these institutional data on each semester's census date (day 20). These data are supplemented with a variety of other longitudinal enrollment, academic, demographic, and financial information and disaggregated in many ways (e.g., by college, major, gender, ethnicity, first-generation status, primary residency, campus residency, socio-economic status, and athletic team) to support analysis and decision-making by stakeholders across the University.

Additional reporting also tracks retention and persistence data through the registration up to the semester census date, providing more current and actionable feedback (Exhibit 2P2a.1: [Enrollment Management - Daily Student Registration File - Spring 2018](#)).

2P2b. Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

The University's 2015-2018 Revitalization and Growth (R&G) Plan incorporated retention improvement as one of the key focus areas, establishing a goal of 4% retention growth for our traditional undergraduate college by the end of the plan period (Exhibit 2P2b.1: [Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 \(Page 6\)](#)). The R&G Leadership Team reviewed historical university retention trends, national norms, and peer school set data (e.g., Kansas Independent Colleges Association data) in establishing this goal.

2P2c. Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion

Retention, persistence, and completion data play an integral part in the University's strategic and operational priorities. These data are presented in a variety of ways, including multiple cohort views (expanding upon the first time, full time (FTFT) IPEDS reporting requirements), multiple term-to-term views, and successful progression, which additionally incorporates satisfactory GPA and credit hour attainment. Completion data are presented at 100%, 125%, and 150% completion for the various undergraduate segments (and 100% and 150% completion for the various graduate segments).

Retention, persistence, and completion data are integrated within the bi-annual Fact Book, which is distributed to all university faculty and staff and relevant sections are presented in many settings, including Town Halls, Faculty Retreats, weekly President's Cabinet meetings, and Board of Trustees meetings (Exhibit 2P2c.1: [Academic Affairs - Fact Book - Spring 2018](#)). Academic and university leadership use these programmatic data from the Fact Book to affirm program health or drive improvement efforts, as warranted by the data.

2P2d. Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)

As student retention, persistence, and completion are functions of many variables and influenced by many experiences throughout the university, meeting retention targets is a shared responsibility. Supporting data are disaggregated in many ways, allowing university employees to have data subsets appropriate to their responsibilities (e.g., reports by major for faculty and Academic Success Coaches, by athletics teams for coaches, and by college and other demographic factors for enrollment management). Given the ability to report data in this manner, the University has better ability to hold individuals accountable for student groups that they directly influence.

These data are also a foundational component of the annual budgeting process. The Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation and University Budget Committee analyze historical retention, persistence, and completion data to forecast future year retention and graduation rates for the colleges, academic programs, and athletics teams. These projections help establish targets for continuing student headcount, discount rates, and tuition revenue and provide guidance for resources needed to support each program in the coming year (Exhibit 2P2d.1: [Finance - Tuition Revenue Forecast - AY 2018-2019](#)).

2P2e. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

Retention, persistence, and completion data originates from the University's Student Information

System, Banner. Base data are made available through detailed reports in the web-reporting tool, WebFocus. Prior to each census date, a group including a Programmer/Analyst from IT, the Registrar, Controller, Director of Financial Aid, and Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation meet to discuss any additions or changes needed to the data extracts as well as the pre-census date data validation process. The Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation compiles detailed information from each census day report into a database, from which a wide array of reporting is generated (e.g., IPEDS surveys, Fact Book, other retention, persistence, and completion reporting, and various other ad hoc reports).

2R2: What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion?

Retention and Persistence

Within the traditional undergraduate college, Friends has experienced significant improvements in retention and persistence in the past two years. The Fall 2016 first time, full-time (FTFT) cohort retained to 2nd fall at 75% (120 of 160), up from 63% (100 of 159) for the Fall 2015 cohort and 64% (590 of 915) for the combined prior five fall cohorts. 1st Spring and 2nd Fall retention rates for the Fall 2016 FTFT and transfer FT cohorts are internal records for the periods noted (Table 2R2.1). These results also indicate achievement of our internal retention goal established in the R&G Plan.

The University's adult undergraduate students are retaining at levels similar to historical averages. This group did experience the biggest one-year improvement between the Fall 2015 and Fall 2016 cohorts for the periods noted (Table 2R2.1). One challenge with the adult undergraduate segment, contributing to the disparity in retention rates when compared to traditional undergraduate students, is the greater propensity for students to take a break from coursework for a term due to various life-events. To address this, Academic Success Coaches monitor returning student registrations during enrollment periods and work individually with students to minimize and, when possible, anticipate any such breaks.

Graduate student retention to 1st spring is currently at levels similar to historical averages, however 2nd fall retention is below historical averages (Table 2R2.1). 2nd fall retention is somewhat skewed by the M.Ed. programs, which are designed to be completed in 1 year. Nevertheless, Friends continues to review programs for opportunities to improve and make data-informed investments in key areas within the college to drive improved retention (e.g., the creation of a Director of Online Learning position, strengthening the partnership with our online learning provider (The Learning House), and new investments in online learning technology).

Table 2R2.1: Undergraduate and Graduate Student Retention								
	Fall 2017 Cohort		Fall 2016 Cohort		Fall 2015 Cohort		Fall 2011 - 2015 Cohorts	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Traditional Undergraduate: FTFT								

Initial Cohort		172		160		159		915
1st Spring Retention	91%	157	90%	144	84%	134	88%	803
2nd Fall Retention			75%	120	63%	100	64%	590
Traditional Undergraduate: Transfer FT								
Initial Cohort		110		106		122		569
1st Spring Retention	93%	102	92%	97	84%	102	85%	482
2nd Fall Retention			70%	74	65%	79	65%	370
Adult Undergraduate: FT and Transfer, FT and PT								
Initial Cohort		76		70		101		733
1st Spring Retention	78%	59	73%	51	69%	70	81%	593
2nd Fall Retention			63%	44	56%	57	64%	472
Graduate: New, FT and PT								
Initial Cohort		221		175		205		1,164
1st Spring Retention	86%	189	88%	154	88%	180	89%	1,031
2nd Fall Retention			69%	120	72%	148	79%	919

Completion

Similar to retention and persistence, traditional undergraduate 4-year completion rates have improved significantly over the past two years. The Fall 2013 FTFT 4-year completion rate was 37% (64 of 175), a significant improvement over the Fall 2012 cohort rate of 29% (55 of 187), and combined prior three cohorts rate of 25% (143 of 580). The Fall 2013 transfer FT 4-year completion rate was 52% (57 of 110), a significant improvement over the Fall 2012 cohort rate of 41% (41 of 100), and combined prior three cohorts rate of 43% (143 of 336). Both of these marks represent record rates for the periods noted (Table 2R2.2).

The University's adult undergraduate segment has maintained a slightly more consistent and much higher 4-year completion rate than the traditional undergraduate college, the latter of which is aided in large measure by the preponderance of transfer students entering adult undergraduate programs. The Fall 2013 total new student cohort 4-year completion rate was 50% (78 of 156), up from 46% (81 of 175) for the Fall 2012 cohort, and 47% (283 of 608) for the combined prior three fall cohorts (Table 2R2.2).

The University's graduate segment has maintained relatively consistent 2-year and 3-year completion rates between the Fall 2010 and Fall 2015 cohorts of all new students (Table 2R2.3). Demographic disaggregation has highlighted some student populations with relatively lower recent 2-year completion rates (e.g., males and minorities), for which Academic Success Coaches are targeting for greater support.

Table 2R2.2: Undergraduate Student Completion								
	Fall 2013 Cohort		Fall 2012 Cohort		Fall 2011 Cohort		Fall 2010 - 2012 Cohorts	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Traditional Undergraduate: FTFT								
Initial Cohort		175		187		218		580
4-year Completion	37%	64	29%	55	21%	46	25%	143
6-year Completion					39%	73	37%	146
Traditional Undergraduate: Transfer FT								
Initial Cohort		110		100		132		336
4-year Completion	52%	57	46%	41	44%	58	43%	143
6-year Completion					48%	65	48%	114
Adult Undergraduate: FT and Transfer, FT and PT								
Initial Cohort		156		175		207		608
4-year Completion	50%	78	46%	81	47%	98	47%	283
6-year Completion					52%	108	50%	218

Table 2R2.3: Graduate Student Completion								
	Fall 2015 Cohort		Fall 2014 Cohort		Fall 2013 Cohort		Fall 2010 - 2014 Cohorts	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Graduate: New, FT and PT								
Initial Cohort		205		226		214		1,256
2-year Completion	58%	119	60%	135	52%	111	62%	782
3-year Completion			79%	179	76%	162	78%	808

2I2: Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented

in the next one to three years?

Retention, persistence, and completion data are a key components of many of the continuous improvement initiatives throughout the university. Two key examples of initiatives directly targeting improvements in these areas are as follows:

Financial Aid

Friends University began collaborating with Ruffalo Noel Levitz (RNL) in AY 2015-2016 to review and improve its financial aid management strategies. From this review process, one of the key findings was that the University's requirements to maintain eligibility for academic scholarships were stricter than many of our peers and likely negatively impacting student retention. As such, beginning in AY 2016-2017, Friends moderated the cumulative GPA required after the first year to maintain an academic scholarship, moving from GPAs of 3.7, 3.5, and 3.0 for the Presidential, Davis, and Tower scholarships (respectively, the top 3 academic scholarships) to GPAs of 3.0, 3.0, and 2.5 respectively. This change profoundly affected the retention of Davis scholarship recipients, in particular, with 2nd year retention for the Fall 2016 first time, full-time cohort retaining at 90% (44 of 49), up from 53% (17 of 32) for the Fall 2015 cohort and 65% (103 of 168) for the combined prior five fall cohorts (Table 2I2.1). Given the systematic nature of this change, the University believes this to be a sustainable change that will allow it to retain students at higher rates going forward.

	Fall 2017 FTFT Cohort		Fall 2016 FTFT Cohort		Fall 2015 FTFT Cohort		Fall 2011 – 2015 FTFT Cohorts	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Presidential Scholars								
Initial Cohort		61		47		48		274
1st Spring Retention	98%	60	94%	44	98%	47	96%	263
2nd Fall Retention			87%	41	79%	38	80%	218
Davis Scholars								
Initial Cohort		55		49		32		168
1st Spring Retention	89%	49	98%	48	78%	25	86%	144
2nd Fall Retention			90%	44	53%	17	61%	103
Towers Scholars								

Initial Cohort		38		38		48		158
1st Spring Retention	89%	34	87%	33	79%	38	83%	130
2nd Fall Retention			63%	24	58%	28	59%	93

Retention and Completion Committee

Continuing the focus on these areas, a Retention and Completion Committee was formed in AY 2017-2018, comprised of the Assistant Dean for Student Success, Director of Residence Life, Director of Admissions, a faculty member, and the newly created Director of New Student Transitions, to address programmatic ways to improve student retention, particularly with first-year students. This committee is initially focusing on improving retention and completion rates among traditional undergraduate students (Exhibit 2I2.1: [Academic Affairs - Retention and Completion Committee Report - AY 2017-2018](#)). Specific improvements already completed or in progress include:

- Added First-Year mentors to all sections of Friends Experience for the entire academic year
- Started a Friends Experience committee to look closer at that course and how to structure it moving forward to improve experience and results
- Hosted events to help students better understand degree planning and how to use our FalconMap degree planning software
- Currently revising our first-year orientation to increase participation and engagement

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Retention and Completion Committee Report - AY 2017-2018
- Enrollment Management - Daily Student Registration File - Spring 2018
- Finance - Tuition Revenue Forecast - AY 2018-2019
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 6)

2.3 - Key Stakeholder Needs

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

2P3: PROCESSES

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

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

2R3: RESULTS

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

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

2I3: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

2P3a. Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)

The University maintains a variety of stakeholder groups developed at the executive-level and/or supported by multiple segments of the university. The President and other university leaders serve in various community organizations, chambers of commerce, and professional boards expanding the university's presence in the community and gaining a better understanding of community stakeholder needs.

The Advancement office serves as the primary group to cultivate relationships with alumni. Along with guidance provided by the Alumni Advisory Council (AAC), the advancement department keeps alumni engaged with the university through regular events, marketing campaigns, and communications (Exhibit 2P3a.1: [Marketing - Friends University Focus Magazine - 2017 Fall](#)). They

annually award alumni and legacy scholarships and recognize distinguished alumni. Additionally, using wealth-screening tools and a list of current funding priorities, the Advancement Office aligns potential donors with university needs to build alumni support of the university. Career Services also connects with alumni by providing access to career planning and job search resources.

The Career Services department, working with faculty and other campus groups, cultivates relationships with local employers to develop pathways for students to enter the workforce and serve the employment needs of the community. Such efforts include hosting career fairs, on-campus interview days, and networking events as well as identifying internships and post-graduation employment opportunities for students.

Program-specific stakeholder groups are also maintained that allow for the development of students through internships and clinical experiences as well as eventual career placements with these employers. Faculty usually develop these stakeholder groups, with examples including:

- Education faculty partnering with local school districts
- Marriage and Family Therapy faculty partnering with churches, schools, jails, and other social service entities
- Zoo Science faculty partnering with the Sedgwick County Zoo (Exhibit 2P3a.2: [Miscellaneous - MOU Friends and Sedgwick County Zoological Society - 2017](#))
- Spanish faculty partnering with the KU Medical School

2P3b. Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership

New stakeholders are targeted based on alignment with the University's mission, strategic plan, and programmatic offerings. Faculty, staff, and administration at various levels are empowered to explore new stakeholder relationships, which are reviewed and approved by the appropriate administrator and/or group (e.g., President's Cabinet or program advisory boards). New stakeholder development typically occurs in conjunction with new program development, increasing the alignment with employer/community needs and the likelihood of program success.

The University also provides ancillary services, including event hosting, to various organizations within the community. Potential events must also align with the mission and strategic plan and are evaluated within the Advancement Office as well as by the Registrar, Physical Plant, Residence Life, Fine Arts, Information Technology, and other offices as appropriate.

2P3c. Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

Changing stakeholder needs are most effectively addressed through regular meetings between university employees and stakeholders themselves.

The President's Advisory Council (PAC) and the Board of Trustees (BOT) are stakeholder groups comprised of the President, President's Cabinet, local business executives, business owners, and community leaders that help Friends identify local business and community needs. Their insights inform the continuous improvement of existing programs, the potential development of new programs (e.g., mechanical engineering), and how the University prepares students for careers after graduation (e.g., increasing focus on internships).

As noted in section 1P3b, the University maintains several program advisory boards with alumni, employers, and community members that provide feedback on program continuous improvement. These advisory boards help ensure the currency of our programs and alignment with changing needs

of employers and the community.

The Apprentice Institute Advisory Board (AIAB) provides guidance for the Apprentice Institute (AI), which promotes the development of resources for individual and church renewal and research to advance the field of Christian formation. The AIAB is beneficial in lending advice on the Apprentice Experience, an 18-month journey in discipleship intended for anyone who wants to deepen their study of Christian spiritual formation and the Apprentice Gathering, an annual conference attended by over 500 individuals.

Career Services and faculty routinely meet with key employers to understand how effectively our students and graduates are prepared for internships and employment. Career Services uses employer feedback (gathered during career fairs, interview days, and individual meetings) to improve career preparations programs (e.g., resume development, interview preparation, and career plan development); faculty use employer feedback as one method to affirm or adjust program content and outcomes to align with related workforce needs.

2P3d. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs

Stakeholder needs are assessed in a variety of ways, through methods most appropriate to the situation. Needs of individual and small group stakeholders are often assessed through semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Needs of larger stakeholder groups (e.g., employer attendees at career fairs) are usually assessed through surveys. Additionally, the University uses external economic indicators to assess needs of the broader community and the University's contributions to those needs.

2P3e. Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

The University assesses performance in meeting stakeholder needs periodically throughout the duration of the partnership and in response to specific events.

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

Advancement

The University's advancement efforts and results have steadily improved in recent years, as evidenced by substantial increases in cash and other gifts received (Table 2R3.1; Exhibit 2R3.1: [Finance - Finance Dashboard - FY 2017](#)). From these efforts, the University has been able to fund several significant strategic priorities, including:

- The Dallas Willard Endowed Chair for Spiritual Formation (\$2,000,000)
- Progress towards an endowed chair in the Fine Arts (50%, \$1,000,000)
- The new Cyber Security Lab (\$300,000)
- Adding a grant writer position in AY 2016-2017
- 25 new grants (\$1,000,000)

	FY2018 est	FY2017	FY2016	FY2015	FY2014

Cash/Other Gifts Received	\$4.0	\$3.8	\$1.8	\$0.9	\$0.9
---------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Career Services

Career Services has greatly increased the number of students it has served, in particular through external events such as employer networking events (Exhibit 2R3.2: [Academic Affairs - Career Services Yearly Comparison - FY 2016-2017](#)). While most external events have seen positive results, the Highway 54 Career Fair (an annual career fairs shared between Friends University and Newman University) has seen declining attendance and is being evaluated.

Community Impact

Community impact has also been strong, as measured by various economic impact indicators collected by the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) and Kansas Independent Colleges Association (KICA) (Exhibit 2R3.3: [Institutional Research - CCCU National Impact Report - 2017](#); Exhibit 2R3.4: [Marketing - Facts and Figures - AY 2016-2017](#); Exhibit 2R3.5: [Institutional Research - KICA Economic Impact Report - 2014](#)):

- \$27.1 MM in added annual regional income
- \$138.8 MM in accumulated contribution of former students employed in the regional workforce

Facilities Use

Facilities use by external stakeholders has also been strong, with nearly 50 organizations hosting events at the university's main campus in the past two years (Exhibit 2R3.6: [Miscellaneous - External Event Master Grid - FY 2017-2018](#)).

2I3: Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The University's new strategic plan identifies numerous priorities to enhance relationships with various stakeholders, most notably within the University-Wide Stewardship theme (Exhibit 2I3.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 \(Page 2\)](#)). Projects set to begin in AY 2018-2019 include:

- Developing an Alumni Relations Engagement Plan that will further support mutually beneficial relationships between the Alumni base and the Institution leading to significant increases in giving, participation in campus events, student mentoring, and student recruitment efforts
- Conducting a Capital Campaign feasibility study
- Developing a revenue stream utilizing the Cyber Security Lab, including revenue generation by providing training to area corporations and other entities (Exhibit 2I3.2: [Strategy - Cyber](#)

[Security Training Business Plan - 2018](#))

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Career Services Yearly Comparison - FY 2016-2017
- Finance - Finance Dashboard - FY 2017
- Institutional Research - CCCU National Impact Report - 2017
- Institutional Research - KICA Economic Impact Report - 2014
- Marketing - Facts and Figures - AY 2016-2017
- Marketing - Friends University Focus Magazine - 2017 Fall
- Miscellaneous - External Event Master Grid - FY 2017-2018
- Miscellaneous - MOU Friends and Sedgwick County Zoological Society - 2017
- Strategy - Cyber Security Training Business Plan - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 (page number 2)

2.4 - Complaint Processes

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

2P4: PROCESSES

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

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

2R4: RESULTS

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

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

2I4: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

2P4a. Collecting complaint information from students

Student complaints at Friends University typically fall into one of three categories: complaints about academic matters; complaints about non-academic matters; and Title IX complaints.

Student complaints about academic and non-academic matters are addressed in the Academic Grievance Procedure and Formal Student Complaint Policy within the Student Handbook (Exhibit 2P4a.1: [Student Handbook](#)). Students have a clear path to file a complaint (with distinct procedures for online students, which include potential remediation by the Kansas Board of Regents (Exhibit 2P4a.2: [KBOR - SARA Complaint Procedure - 2018](#)) as well as an appeal process up to the VP of Academic Affairs.

The Title IX policy has clear processes that follow guidelines from the Office of Civil Rights in the Federal Department of Education. Details regarding the scope of potential complaints, procedures for filing a grievance, the review process, and the appeal process are addressed in the Title IX Policy within the Student Handbook.

2P4b. Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

The process for faculty grievances can be found in the Faculty Handbook. All faculty have access to the grievance policy and appeals are available depending on the nature of the matter being appealed. There are clear procedures for faculty members to resolve grievances concerning administrative decisions and policies, including for differences of opinion about Faculty Handbook interpretations (Exhibit 2P4b.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 32\)](#)). The faculty handbook also outlines a process that explains how student complaints can be used by faculty, where appropriate, to provide a learning opportunity for students (Exhibit 2P4b.2: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 36\)](#)).

Faculty and other stakeholders also have access to Title IX and EEOC complaint policies and processes (Exhibit 2P4b.3: [Student Handbook](#)) as well as the newly developed Whistleblower Protection Policy (noted in section 2I4).

2P4c. Learning from complaint information and determining actions

Due to the decentralized nature of complaint storage, a centralized office does not systematically review complaints for patterns of behavior across the university. The Human Resources (HR) Office creates and updates policies as appropriate based upon feedback from other University leaders, periodic policy review, and emerging best practices in HR.

2P4d. Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

Complainants are kept informed of all actions during the complaint remediation processes (as noted in sections 2P4a and 2P4b). Such communications may include in-person discussion with an appropriate party, written decision from an appropriate party, and/or advisement of potential next steps for further review/appeal.

2P4e. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

Complaints are resolved through the formal processes noted in sections 2P4a and 2P4b. Tools and instruments used to evaluate these complaints include:

- In the case of personnel issues, normal documentation occurs and remains confidential as part of personnel files
- As required by Title IX, all sexual assault cases are reviewed to ensure that we are doing everything we can to ensure a safe environment for students, faculty, and staff
- Courses are surveyed through the IDEA student rating system, where students are able to register complaints about specific courses and faculty members; those results are reviewed by faculty, division chairs, and deans each year as part of the faculty evaluation process
- The University also administers various surveys throughout the year (e.g., student satisfaction surveys) which might identify complaints

2R4: What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints?

Student complaints are reviewed and stored in a decentralized manner by the parties who receive the complaint and are addressed fairly and expeditiously to the extent allowed up through the various appeals processes. Title IX complaints are stored within Title IX Coordinator's Office in accordance with the law.

2I4: Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Whistleblower Protection Policy

While there are many internal controls and operating procedures that detect, prevent, and deter improper activities, Friends University implemented a Whistleblower Protection Policy in AY 2017-2018 to provide an additional avenue for employees to raise concerns regarding irregularities or improper behavior that could have an adverse impact on the University. If the employee is uncomfortable speaking with their supervisor or HR about the issue, or feels that such discussions have not appropriately remedied the issue, a newly designated Whistleblower Compliance Officer may review their complaint. In instances where the allegations may be against a member of the President's Cabinet or the Board of Trustees (BOT), a concerned employee may contact the Chair of the BOT Finance Audit Committee. In all instances, anonymity is protected to the extent possible and whistleblowers will be protected from reprisals for whistleblowing in good faith (Exhibit 2I4.1: [Human Resources - Whistleblower Protection Policy - 2017](#)).

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 32)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 36)
- Human Resources - Whistleblower Protection Policy - 2017
- KBOR - SARA Complaint Procedure - 2018

2.5 - Building Collaborations and Partnerships

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

2P5: PROCESSES

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

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

2R5: RESULTS

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

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

2I5: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

2P5a. Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)

Selecting partners for collaboration may be done within any department and at multiple levels within the university, depending on the size and scope of the collaboration. Most potential partnerships will be reviewed and approved by the departmental VP and/or President's Cabinet; significant partnership proposals may be submitted to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for approval. These collaborative efforts are often developed in response to strategic objectives (e.g., the University's partnership with McConnell Air Force Base is related to the Revitalization and Growth Plan objective of developing a Cyber Security program) (Exhibit 2P5a.1: [Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 \(Page 11\)](#)). The University uses information from multiple sources to select new partners for collaboration,

including environmental scans, economic data, and feedback from advisory boards and existing partners. In all collaborations, the sponsoring employee(s) must demonstrate alignment between University, the collaborating partner, and collaboration purpose and the University Mission, Vision, and Values.

2P5b. Building and maintaining relationships with partners

The University maintains collaborations and partnerships with a wide range of educational, civic, and business organizations (Exhibit 2P5b.1: [Friends University Website - Connections & Partnerships - 2018](#)).

As noted in section 1P4c, the University maintains several articulation agreements with regional community colleges that allow students to transfer in associates degrees, fulfilling the general education requirements and gaining junior standing. Friends targets key feeder institutions for program-specific articulation agreements, facilitating an easy transfer of academic credit from similar courses and associated degree programs. The University also partners with local universities on occasion when pooling resources provides efficiency gains or the ability to better scale (e.g., collaborating with Newman University to host one combined career fair for both schools).

Similarly, the University partners with local school districts to offer dual credit courses to high school students as well as specific activities with high school programs (e.g., Cyber Patriot and fine arts). These programs allow students to gain advanced standing (at reduced cost) when entering college and provide early opportunities to develop student interest in the university.

Friends also partners with educational organizations that align with and help further its mission (e.g., the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCCU) and Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)). These organizations both have active list serves that enable networking and knowledge sharing. CIC membership also enables Friends to participate in the CIC Tuition Exchange Program.

The University maintains an active presence within the community, collaborating with a variety of civic organizations. Administration and faculty regularly participate with the Wichita and Hispanic Chambers of Commerce and Rotary Club to develop specific business and programmatic relationships. The University also fills various community needs through collaborative efforts such Friendship Fields, a program that allows college-age adults with intellectual disabilities to experience college life while also offering Friends University students the opportunity to work with these students (Exhibit 2P5b.2: [Friends University Website - Friendship Fields - 2018](#)). Friends also participates in an annual university-wide service day for the Salvation Army.

The adult undergraduate and graduate programs began developing a corporate partnership program in AY 2016-2017 to boost lead generation. As part of this program, companies who sign the corporate partnership agreement get a 10% discount for promoting/advertising the university's programs and allowing the recruitment team to meet with their employees periodically throughout the year (Exhibit 2P5b.3: [Friends University Website - Corporate Partner Agreement - 2018](#)).

2P5c. Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

Partnership effectiveness is assessed in various ways, through methods most appropriate to the situation. Qualitative research, including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and surveys, are often complimented with quantitative research (e.g., economic indicators and internal profitability measures) to provide a robust view of partnership effectiveness.

2P5d. Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

The University assesses the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective periodically throughout the duration of the partnership and in response to specific events. Through partnership with certain organizations (e.g., CIC) we are also able to review external benchmarking data; the continued use of these data to evaluate other aspects of the university indicate value in this and similar partnerships.

2R5: What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships?

Articulation Agreements

The University has expanded both the number of schools with which we have partnered to develop articulation agreements as well as the number of articulations (i.e., adding program-specific articulation agreements) in recent years (Table 2R5.1).

	AY 2014-2015	AY 2015-2016	AY 2016-2017	AY 2017-2018
Articulation Agreements	12	23	23	25
Partnering Colleges	11	16	16	16

Dual Credit

The University has expanded both the number of schools with which we have partnered to offer dual credit courses as well as the number of students enrolling in dual credit courses in recent years (Table 2R5.2).

	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Dual Credit Students	210	154	276	231
Partnering High Schools	5	6	10	10

Corporate Partnerships

In AY 2016-2017, the university established corporate partnerships with four organizations. These partnerships led to 32 additional enrolled students who received a total of (\$43,471) in corporate discounts. In AY 2017-2018, the number of partnerships grew to 12, leading to 59 additional enrolled students and a total of (\$80,655) in corporate discounts.

2I5: Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

University-Wide Stewardship

Our new strategic plan identifies numerous priorities to build partnerships with other organizations, most notably within the University-Wide Stewardship theme (Exhibit 2I5.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 \(Page 2\)](#)). Projects set to begin in AY 2018-2019 include:

- Establishing coordinated central support for partnerships; this includes the creation of a Partnership Committee, responsible for regularly identifying, coordinating, and tracking corporate, non-profit, academic and internship partners as well as communicating between various segments of the university
- Creating a Corporate Sponsor Program
- Implementing a strategy to position Friends as valuable resource for business/community by establishing a Speakers Bureau

Sources

- Friends University Website - Connections & Partnerships - 2018
- Friends University Website - Corporate Partner Agreement - 2018
- Friends University Website - Friendship Fields - 2018
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 11)
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 (page number 2)

3 - Valuing Employees

3.1 - Hiring

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

3P1: PROCESSES

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

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

3R1: RESULTS

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

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

3I1: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

3P1a. Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)

Friends University maintains a team approach to recruiting qualified candidates for staff positions

(Exhibit 3P1a.1: [Human Resources - Staff New Hire Process - 2018](#)). Once a new staff position need is budgeted and approved, Human Resources (HR) begins working with the hiring manager to ensure that a new or current job description exists:

- For new positions, the hiring manager completes the Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) and forwards it to HR for the creation and approval of a new job description. The job description includes the duties, expectations, knowledge, and skills necessary to recruit qualified candidates.
- For replacement positions, HR forwards the current job description to the hiring manager for review, revisions, and approval.

A Personnel Requisition Form (PRF) is created by the hiring manager and routed to the appropriate Division VP for approval. The position budget information and salary range are added by HR and then the VP of Administration reviews and gives the final approval to post a position. All full-time staff position descriptions are graded and maintained in the University's compensation and position description management system, Compease.

All approved position descriptions are listed on the University's website (Exhibit 3P1a.2: [Friends University Website - Employment Opportunities - 2018](#)) as well as several other external academic and career job posting boards per the Job Posting Policy (Exhibit 3P1a.3: [Human Resources - Job Posting Policy - 2013](#)). During the application process, all candidates are asked to read and acknowledge they have read Friends University's mission statement.

Applicant resumes are reviewed by HR, the hiring manager, and search committees. Top candidates are selected for initial phone interviews, with two to three typically selected for subsequent on-site interviews by members of the search committee, HR, and other relevant University stakeholders; candidates for University Officer positions are also interviewed by the Board of Trustees. Throughout the interview process, candidates are assessed for mission-fit and appropriate leadership and content expertise, among other qualifications.

Upon hire, all employees receive a New Hire Orientation Guide to orient them to the University (Exhibit 3P1a.4: [Human Resources - New Hire Orientation Checklist - 2017](#)). Additionally, within their first 30 days of employment, new hires participate in Friends 101 – a full campus tour along with an opportunity to meet the Cabinet Counsel and learn about our Quaker heritage and the history of Friends University.

The process for hiring faculty is similar to the above and detailed in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 3P1a.5: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 33\)](#)).

3P1b. Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)

The University ensures that all faculty members are qualified to teach in their respective disciplines by requiring that they hold degrees and professional credentials appropriate to the level(s) and discipline(s) they teach, as determined by HLC and other appropriate specialized program accreditors. This extends to adjunct and dual credit faculty in addition to full-time faculty (Exhibit 3P1b.1: [Academic Affairs - Minimum Qualifications for Adjunct Instructors - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 3P1b.2: [Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty pay rates and Terminal Degree Listing - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 3P1b.3: [Academic Affairs - All Faculty Degree Information - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 3P1b.4: [Academic Affairs - Dual Credit Instructor Credentials - AY 2017-2018](#); Exhibit 3P1.5: [Academic Affairs - HLC Dual Credit Extension - 2017](#)).

HR oversees an online applicant management system, Hirebridge, to manage all confidential applicant documentation and data during search processes, ensuring that applicants meet the minimum required position requirements. Once the hiring manager approves a candidate for hire, HR reviews and authenticates the candidate's documents; once the offer is accepted, HR completes a background check using National Screening Bureau (NATSB).

3P1c. Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)

Faculty workload policies are detailed in the Faculty Handbook and include the following (Exhibit 3P1c.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 19\)](#)):

- Faculty must teach 24 credit hours over the course of nine months (August – May)
- Faculty must generate 300 student credit hours over those same nine months
- Faculty may teach in excess of this requirement (overload), within defined limits
- Faculty may receive teaching reductions (or workload equivalencies) for various administrative duties

Similarly, adjunct faculty have teaching limitations, defined in the Adjunct Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 3P1c.2: [Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 13\)](#)).

In conjunction with these faculty requirements, faculty are hired and assigned to courses with consideration for small-to-moderate class sizes and student-faculty ratios. All courses have maximum enrollments, usually around 25 for lectures and online courses. Additional sections are typically opened to accommodate further students and control class size.

These considerations, as well as anticipated faculty departures, new program needs, projected enrollment changes, and specialized accreditation requirements are all used in developing faculty sufficiency requirements in the annual budget process.

3P1d. Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services

Support staff sufficiency is reviewed in conjunction with enrollment trends and changing student needs. Support service departments review their staffing needs annually as part of the budgeting process and may request staffing changes/increases when they deem necessary. These requests are reviewed with other budget requests as part of this process and approved when appropriate. A recent focus in support staffing has been to evaluate systems and processes for efficiency to better serve students with existing staff.

3P1e. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

HR tracks multiple hiring measures, including the turnover rate, length of service, and identifying the voluntary reasons employees leave the institution. The college Deans track multiple hiring measures including faculty workload and course size.

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

Employee Turnover

Employee turnover has diminished in the past two years since reaching peak levels in 2014 and 2015 amid heightened periods of institutional change. Within faculty ranks, much of the recent turnover has been a result of retirements; staff turnover has been close to prior year averages; and administrative turnover has greatly decreased since developing a stable leadership team (Exhibit 3R1.1: [Human Resources - Calendar Year Turnover Rates - 2018](#)). These results indicate momentum in bolstering a positive environment for all employees.

Class Size and Student/Faculty Ratio

Undergraduate class size has been consistent and demonstrates a proclivity for keeping class sections reasonably small (Table 3R1.1). Additionally, all three colleges have maintained low student-faculty ratios (as defined by IPEDS) for the past several fall terms, supporting high student-faculty interactions (Exhibit 3R1.2: [Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018 \(Page 5\)](#)).

Table 3R1.1: Undergraduate Class Size								
Term	Class Sections							Total
	2-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-99	100+	
Fall 2017	186	133	74	17	5	5	1	421
Fall 2016	173	124	65	18	4	7	1	392

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

New Employee Orientation

A strategic goal under Thriving Community is to Empower and Equip Faculty & Staff by revitalizing new employee orientation. The University’s current training resources will be assessed and any gaps in training identified during that process. We plan to have two tracks with core components identified for faculty and staff implemented by 2020.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 13)
- Academic Affairs - Adjunct Faculty pay rates and Terminal Degree Listing - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - All Faculty Degree Information - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Dual Credit Instructor Credentials - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 19)

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 33)
- Academic Affairs - HLC Dual Credit Extension - 2017
- Academic Affairs - Minimum Qualifications for Adjunct Instructors - AY 2017-2018
- Friends University Website - Employment Opportunities - 2018
- Human Resources - Calendar Year Turnover Rates - 2018
- Human Resources - Job Posting Policy - 2013
- Human Resources - New Hire Orientation Checklist - 2017
- Human Resources - Staff New Hire Process - 2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018 (page number 5)

3.2 - Evaluation and Recognition

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

3P2: PROCESSES

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

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

3R2: RESULTS

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

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

3I2: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

3P2a. Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees

The University maintains two primary evaluation systems for employees: one for staff and one for faculty.

Staff and administrator evaluations center around the position description and Annual Plan of Work

(APW) (Exhibit 3P2a.1: [Human Resources - Annual Plan of Work - 2016](#)). Within the APW, the employee and supervisor agree upon one to three key objectives for the employee to complete in the upcoming year, in addition to the base responsibilities noted in the position description. At the end of the year, the employee will self-assess their performance against these goals and related mission and core values (Exhibit 3P2a.2: [Human Resources - Staff Self Appraisal - 2016](#)). The supervisor then completes a staff appraisal (mirroring the framework of the self-appraisal) and conducts a performance appraisal meeting with the employee to complete the cycle (Exhibit 3P2a.3: [Human Resources - Staff Appraisal - 2016](#)).

Faculty evaluations focus on the review of four key components: effective teaching, scholarship, service, and continuous professional improvement. Specific details of these components, including methods for evaluation and acceptable forms of evidence, are articulated in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 3P2a.4: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 23\)](#)). After the end of the year, faculty self-assess their performance against these components. Faculty within their first year of service are also observed teaching in the classroom at least once per semester. The Dean or Dean's designee then completes a faculty evaluation and conducts a performance appraisal meeting with the employee to complete the cycle. These evaluations are used in making recommendations regarding promotion and tenure, retention, non-reappointment, and terminal contracts.

3P2b. Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators

Faculty, staff, and administrators engage in ongoing conversations with supervisors regarding job expectations and performance. These ongoing conversations are supplemented with the formal review processes noted in section 3P2a, which expressly include feedback from both employee and supervisor.

The Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies and Program Directors provide adjunct faculty members with regular communications including:

- Newsletters
- Video blogs providing guidance, ongoing engagement, encouragement, and a timeline for course and university deadlines
- Tri-annual adjunct faculty retreats providing professional development

Additionally, adjunct faculty receive personal notes from the Dean on a collection of the anecdotal comments students provide through course evaluations. These reviews are highlighted with notes of encouragement, strategies for improvements, and affirmations of effective teaching.

Adjunct faculty within the traditional undergraduate programs receive regular communications from the Division Chairs overseeing their programs including expectations regarding assessment, effective teaching strategies, and University policies and procedures.

Input from and communication to employees regarding performance expectations take place through the various communication vehicles noted in the Internal Communication Plan (Exhibit 3P2b.1: [Marketing - Internal Communication Plan - 2018](#)).

3P2c. Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services

The Staff Performance Appraisal process (noted in section 3P2a) includes development of individual performance goals in collaboration between the employee and supervisor within the APW as well as

discussion of performance relative to mission and values. These components ensure alignment between employee priorities, institutional objectives, and employee evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation system aligns fully with institutional objectives by promoting excellence in teaching and other faculty duties and encouraging on-going faculty development.

3P2d. Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)

Performance of all faculty, staff, and administrators are evaluated annually through the processes noted in sections 3P2a and 3P2b.

3P2e. Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance

Friends honors faculty each year through the presentation of the W.A. Young Award and Jan LaFever Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award. These awards for full-time and adjunct faculty teaching excellence are presented at Commencement based upon nominations from students, faculty, and staff (Exhibit 3P2e.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 92\)](#)).

In AY 2017-2018, Friends established the RISE to Excellence Award to honor an outstanding staff member who demonstrates a high level of commitment to serving our students and Friends University while also displaying dedication to Friends University's mission, vision, and values. This award is presented at the Annual State of the University address, based upon nominations from faculty and staff (Exhibit 3P2e.2: [Human Resources - RISE to Excellence Award Nomination Form - 2018](#)).

The University also recognizes years of service milestones at the Annual State of the University Address.

The University partners with Compease, a web-based salary administration program, to help ensure that Friends offers competitive salaries to attract and retain talent. Compease monitors the external job market to help the University develop job grades for each position and set appropriate pay ranges to manage internal equity.

3P2f. Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

The University recognizes faculty and staff accomplishments, significant activities, and birthdays in the weekly Among Friends newsletter and biannual Friends Focus alumni magazine. During the summer term, the University provides free vacation time to all employees on Friday afternoons. The Health, Wellness, and Events Committee promotes community engagement through various events and activities.

3P2g. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The University measures employee satisfaction through the Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS), administered every three years (most recently in AY 2017-2018). Friends also uses data from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR), other higher education surveys, and Compease to analyze compensation and benefit trends within the local market and other institutions of higher education.

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

Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS)

The ESS measures employee importance and satisfaction around four dimensions: campus culture, work environment, institutional goals, and involvement in planning. Survey respondents from the AY 2017-2018 administration indicated an overall average satisfaction of 3.8 (on a 5-point scale), up from 3.5 in AY 2014-2015. These results help affirm the positive changes made in recent years under the current leadership team. The University has a goal of further improving average ratings to 4.2 by the next survey administration.

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

Promotion and Tenure Process Enhancement

A task force is currently charged with reviewing the categories for promotion and tenure and proposing criteria and related processes for the promotion and tenure committee to review and implement in AY 2018-2019.

Thriving Community Strategic Initiatives

The newly implemented Strategic Plan includes several initiatives investing in faculty and staff including (Exhibit 3I2.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 \(Page 6\)](#)):

- Develop action plans to address the top three opportunities for improvement identified from the recent ESS and evaluate opportunities to increase diversity and inclusion
- Institute recurring campus wide community events that promote connectedness, such as the Back to school day for Employees and their Families at Eberly Farms

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 23)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 92)
- Human Resources - Annual Plan of Work - 2016
- Human Resources - RISE to Excellence Award Nomination Form - 2018
- Human Resources - Staff Appraisal - 2016
- Human Resources - Staff Self Appraisal - 2016
- Marketing - Internal Communication Plan - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018

- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 (page number 6)

3.3 - Development

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

3P3: PROCESSES

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

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

3R3: RESULTS

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

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

3I3: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

3P3a. Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)

The University provides and supports a variety of professional development opportunities for all employees. Identification of professional development needs occurs through discussions between employee and supervisor. These needs are often addressed through the development of the Annual Plan of Work and Annual Faculty Evaluation processes, noted in section 3P2a. Additionally, the VP of Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate serve as resources to support professional development.

Professional development areas supported include: content expertise, pedagogy, andragogy, technology usage, and leadership.

Friends offers tuition remission to all employees for undergraduate and graduate degrees (Exhibit 3P3a.1: [Human Resources - Tuition Remission Policy - 2016](#)). This benefit is primarily utilized by staff as well as employee families (faculty typically hold academic credentials at or above levels offered by the University).

The University provides opportunities for faculty development via internal events and programs (e.g., bi-annual faculty retreats). During faculty retreats, faculty and staff present various topics that assists in colleague professional development. Examples of recent topics include student retention, faith learning integration, student mental health needs, information about new assessment software, and faculty research report-outs. Adjunct faculty also have faculty retreats each semester (including summer) that provide similar professional development opportunities (Exhibit 3P3a.2: [Academic Affairs - Summer Professional Development Days - AY 2017-2018](#)).

Conference attendance is also regularly supported for administrators, staff, and faculty. Conferences include those focused on accreditation activities, specific functions and/or disciplines, and leadership (noted in section 4P3g).

3P3b. Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)

Continuing professional development is promoted as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and included as one of four components of the annual faculty evaluation process (Exhibit 3P3b.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 28\)](#)). To support this expectation, the University allocates funding annually to continuing professional faculty development (e.g., scholarly writing and publications, scholarly or professional presentations, conference attendance, and professional memberships). Faculty may apply for University Research Grants to defray costs for research and publication expenses (Exhibit 3P3b.2: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 90\)](#)). Faculty may also apply for Sabbatical Leave to further professional growth (Exhibit 3P3b.3: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 88\)](#)).

Specialized accredited programs have additional funding allocated to ensure currency of professional membership/licensure as required by the accrediting body and encourage regular attendance at accreditation conferences.

The Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction system (IDEA) provides instructors with feedback regarding teaching effectiveness. Through this service, instructors also receive research-based feedback to improve specific pedagogical processes, linked to each of 19 different teaching effectiveness measures against which they are rated (Exhibit 3P3b.4: [IDEA - Notes on Instruction - 2018](#)).

3P3c. Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)

Development for student support staff is supported through professional membership/licensure subsidization, professional association conference attendance, internal training, and access to various affinity groups, as detailed in sections 2P1i and 3P3a.

3P3d. Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives

As noted in sections 3P3a, 3P3b, and 3P3c, the University’s budget process supports professional development by all employees. Similarly, the performance review process supports and expects professional development. Universal policies governing funding of these activities ensures alignment with institutional objectives; further alignment is gained through the supervisor and HR approvals embedded in these processes.

3P3e. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Professional development needs and effectiveness are measured in multiple ways including:

- Faculty development fund usage
- Tuition remission usage
- Professional development activity feedback
- Student ratings of faculty instruction
- Needs assessments

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

Faculty Development Funding

Faculty development funding has increased over the past two years, demonstrating an increased commitment to supporting professional development (Table 3R3.1).

Table 3R3.1: Faculty Development Expenditures (Actual and Budget)				
	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Budget	FY2019 Budget
Faculty Development Funding	\$47,252	\$38,983	\$74,995	\$71,408

Employee Tuition Remission

Tuition remission for employees and their families has been strong (Table 3R3.2).

Table 3R3.2: Employee Tuition Remission (Actual and Budget)				
	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Budget	FY2019 Budget
Tuition Remission Funding	\$(774,398)	\$(548,716)	\$(510,000)	\$(430,000)

**Figures also include tuition remission for employee spouses and dependent children*

***Tuition remission policy for master's degrees was updated in Spring 2016 to provide 60% remission for employees only (was previously 100% remission and included spouses)*

3I3: Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Center for Teaching and Learning

The strategic plan includes an initiative to develop a center for teaching and learning grounded in faith (Exhibit 3I3.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 \(Page 1\)](#)). While the long term goal is that this will be part of a larger building project, we have plenty of places on campus to create a space for a meaningful program in the interim.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 28)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 57)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 88)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 90)
- Academic Affairs - Summer Professional Development Days - AY 2017-2018
- Human Resources - Tuition Remission Policy - 2016
- IDEA - Notes on Instruction - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018 (page number 1)

4 - Planning and Leading

4.1 - Mission and Vision

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

4P1: PROCESSES

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

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

4R1: RESULTS

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

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

4I1: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

4P1a. Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)

In conjunction with the installment of a new President in AY 2015-2016, the University sought to review its Mission, Vision, and Values statements. During this time, the President led focus groups with faculty and staff to understand the effectiveness of these statements. Feedback indicated a lack of involvement in creating the Values and Vision statements and little understanding of how the University sought to implement those values. As such, the President's Cabinet began drafting new Values and Vision statements, seeking and incorporating feedback from faculty and staff, the Board of Trustees (BOT), and a local public relations firm as well as incorporating relevant information from prior iterations of these statements. After a thorough review and revision process, the BOT approved new Vision and R.I.S.E. Values statements that more closely aligned with the University's mission, fully embracing service to others through intellectual, spiritual, and professional development (Exhibit 4P1a.1: [Meeting Minutes - BOT - 2016-10-22 \(Page 3\)](#)).

The Vision statement was further reviewed and updated in AY 2017-2018 through the development of the University's new Strategic Plan. This document will be reviewed annually by the BOT.

Regarding the Mission statement, the BOT has stated their desire to continue with the current Mission statement, as it reflects the essential purpose of the institution as a Christian university of Quaker heritage.

4P1b. Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Institutional actions and priorities are reviewed annually through the budgeting/planning process and during the strategic planning process. During these processes, the President's Cabinet, BOT, and select faculty, staff, and administrators review existing programs and processes for alignment with the University's R.I.S.E. Values and, as appropriate, reaffirm them. New priorities and actions are similarly reviewed for alignment to the R.I.S.E. Values prior to approval. Additionally, faculty, staff, and administration review institutional actions within their organizations/departments throughout the year to ensure continuous alignment with the University's Values.

4P1c. Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)

Friends University's Mission, Vision, and Value Statements are articulated publicly through the University website (Exhibit 4P1c.1: [Friends University Website - Mission and Vision - 2018](#)). The Mission, Vision, Values statements are posted throughout the University and a desk reminder trifold has been distributed to each faculty and staff member. The Mission statement is on the application form for hiring and prominently displayed in various campus locations. Additionally, at the President's annual State of the University Address and at Town Hall meetings, the Mission, Vision, and Values statements are reinforced and used as a guiding document for strategic decisions. Furthermore, the Mission, Vision, and Values are discussed with students each semester as part of the Friends Experience first-year seminar.

4P1d. Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission (1.A.2)

As noted in section 1P4, the University's academic programs are managed through a robust academic governance process that includes review and approval processes by each college's Academic Council and the University's Academic Cabinet. As expressly noted within the charters for each of these governing bodies, they ensure that new programs and major activities are appropriate expressions of

the University Mission (Exhibit 4P1d.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 59\)](#)). Additional academic and co-curricular services (e.g., the Academic Resource Center (ARC), Campus Ministries, Career Services Office, Counseling Office, and Library) are governed by members of President's Cabinet, who ensure similar Mission alignment.

4P1e. Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)

Friends University's Mission and Values serve as the foundation for the University's newly implemented Strategic Plan, with the Values (Respect, Inclusion, Service, and Excellence) evident in the priorities contained within the four strategic themes (Robust Enrollment, University-Wide Stewardship, Thriving Community, and Dynamic Learning). From this alignment, there is consistency between the University's priorities and the resources allocated to these priorities.

Furthermore, as part of the annual budgeting process all existing and new funding is reviewed within the context of Mission, Vision, and Values alignment. Priorities that align with these statements receive appropriate funding, whereas proposed initiatives that are misaligned do not.

4P1f. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

In reviewing the currency and relevance of its Mission, Vision, and Values statements, Friends periodically seeks feedback from faculty, staff, and administration through a series of focus groups and community forums. The University also contracts with consulting firms to evaluate the messaging and branding of its Mission, Vision, and Values statements during periods of redevelopment.

Additionally, the University administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) on a 3-year rotational cycle to freshmen and senior undergraduate students throughout the university. As part of this survey, Friends also participates in the NSSE Mission Engagement Consortium to understand how familiar our students are with our mission. Administered in 2017 and 2014, results from this survey are compared against other schools participating in the Consortium as well as internally to identify any trends or areas of opportunity.

4R1: What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values?

The most recent NSSE was administered in the spring of 2017. 232 first-year and 455 senior students were included in the survey population, with responses rates of 20% and 23% respectively. Trend data between 2017 and 2014 indicate an improvement in student familiarity with the University's Mission, both in terms of mean institutional ratings and comparisons to mean ratings for the overall consortium; these improvements were noted at both the freshmen and senior level (Exhibit 4R1.1: [Institutional Research - NSSE Consortium Report - MECIC - 2017](#); Exhibit 4R1.2: [Institutional Research - NSSE Consortium Report - MECIC - 2014](#)). Additional segmentation between traditional and undergraduate students indicate alignment between these student populations (Table 4R1.1).

Table 4R1.1: NSSE Mission Engagement

	Freshmen Students			Seniors		
	Mean Rating*	Responses	Mean Effect Size Difference**	Mean Rating*	Responses	Mean Effect Size Difference**
NSSE 2017	4.00	37	-0.06	3.92	92	-0.01
<i>Traditional Undergraduate</i>	3.93	34		3.88	62	
<i>Adult Undergraduate</i>	4.47	3		3.94	30	
NSSE 2014	3.84	52	-0.24	3.81	208	-0.11
<i>*Average rating of 19 questions (1 = strongly disagree...5 = strongly agree)</i>						
<i>**As compared to the Consortium averages (13 schools in 2017; 22 schools in 2014)</i>						

4I1: Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Quaker Heritage Week

As part of continuing efforts to promote the Mission, Vision, and Values along with the University’s heritage, Friends launched the 1st annual Quaker Heritage Week in AY 2017-2018. This weeklong series of events invites students and faculty to explore the history of the Quaker tradition and the founders at Friends University. Furthermore, these events facilitate numerous opportunities for students to grow spiritually, academically, and in service to the community (Exhibit 4I1.1: [Mission, Vision, Values - 1st Annual Quaker Heritage Week - 2018](#)).

Vision

As noted in sections 4P1a and 4I2, the University redefined its Vision in AY 2017-2018 to align with the newly implemented strategic plan. This statement will be reviewed annually by leadership to ensure alignment and currency with university priorities.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 59)
- Friends University Website - Mission and Vision - 2018
- Institutional Research - NSSE Consortium Report - MECIC - 2014
- Institutional Research - NSSE Consortium Report - MECIC - 2017
- Meeting Minutes - BOT - 2016-10-22
- Meeting Minutes - BOT - 2016-10-22 (page number 3)

- Mission, Vision, Values - 1st Annual Quaker Heritage Week - 2018

4.2 - Strategic Planning

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

4P2: PROCESSES

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

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

4R2: RESULTS

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

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

4I2: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

4P2a. Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)

The University's newly implemented strategic plan was developed in AY 2017-2018, replacing the prior 3-year Revitalization & Growth (R&G) Plan that was completed the same year. The process used in developing the current strategic plan was transparent and engaging, encompassing the

institution as a whole and incorporating feedback from multiple university and external constituents (Exhibit 4P2a.1: [Strategy - Strategic Planning Process - AY 2017-2018](#)).

The planning framework for this strategic plan was established at the beginning of AY 2017-2018 by the President's Cabinet (Cabinet) and the consulting firm Credo. Early in the Fall semester, this framework was introduced to the Board of Trustees (BOT) and subsequently introduced to the campus community at Community Day, allowing all university employees to provide input in building the strategic plan details. The Business Advisory Committee, including the President, community leaders, and local businesspersons, also provide feedback throughout the year regarding ideas for strategic growth and ways to address emerging business needs. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) (Exhibit 4P2a.2: [Strategy - Strategic Planning Steering Committee - AY 2017-2018](#)), with guidance from Credo, segmented feedback into four over-arching strategic themes (Robust Enrollment, University-Wide Stewardship, Thriving Community, and Dynamic Learning) and four dimensions each theme will address (Student Stakeholder, Financial Resources, Internal Processes, and Organizational Capacity) for a total of 16 categories into which various strategic initiatives will be placed (Exhibit 4P2a.3: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 \(Page 8\)](#)). The SPSC then formed four cross-functional teams to support the themes to develop, define, and prioritize initiatives within each dimension. Upon completion, the strategic plan was presented to the BOT for final approval and shared with the University community.

The SPSC will review progress on the strategic plan monthly and will update initiatives (e.g., beginning new initiatives as current ones complete, adding new initiatives, and modifying existing initiatives) based on internal analysis and feedback from the Cabinet, BOT, and other stakeholders. Progress will also be reviewed throughout the year by the Cabinet and BOT.

4P2b. Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)

The Cabinet has primary responsibility for monitoring and ensuring alignment of operational activities and plans with the institution's mission, vision, and values. Cabinet reviews ongoing assessment of student learning and program review. Cabinet works with the Budget Committee to develop the annual budget (described in section 5P3), which includes detailed forecasts for enrollment, tuition and non-tuition revenue, and salary and non-salary expenses (Exhibit 4P2b.1: [Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018](#)). Additionally, they monitor financial statements and operational results (e.g., enrollment and marketing) regularly to ensure appropriate progress towards institutional goals, and adjust efforts as necessary.

The University's Mission and R.I.S.E. Values (Respect, Inclusion, Service, Excellence) serve as the foundation of the strategic plan and are integrated into the plan through the dimensions and strategic themes. Student Learning is addressed through the Dynamic Learning theme, with multiple initiatives sponsored by the VP of Academic Affairs that target cultivating the academic experience, increasing retention, and expanding High Impact Practices. Planning and budgeting are addressed through the Financial Resources dimension, with initiative funding secured in the annual budget process and/or from donor contributions. Evaluation of operations is addressed through the Internal Processes and Organizational Capacities dimensions, ensuring that these initiatives are managed with efficient processes and adequate resources to effectively accomplish initiative goals.

During the past few years, the Mission, Vision, and Values have been refined. The Vision statement was specifically redefined again upon the development of the strategic plan and will be evaluated annually by the BOT to ensure appropriate fit. Furthermore, it is expected that the Vision will be redefined upon the completion of each subsequent strategic plan creation.

4P2c. Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)

Following section 4P2b, the Cabinet also maintains primary responsibility for aligning efforts across various segments within the University. Cabinet review of key processes and policies ensures awareness by all appropriate functional areas within the University and at various levels within each functional area. Alignment within and across functions is also achieved through various committees, governance bodies, and periodic functional team meetings (e.g., Retention and Completion Committee, Faculty Permanent Standing Committees, Academic Councils for each college, and the university's Academic Cabinet). Cabinet representatives are included in most key University committees, strengthening the alignment between administration and faculty and staff; some committees also include student representatives to further enhance the alignment of efforts across the University (e.g., Student Government Association, Student Council, and the Professional Education Board).

These alignments are also strengthened through the University's various planning cycles, including the annual budget and strategic planning processes. Budget Committee-members and SPSC-members optimize resource deployment by funding initiatives that demonstrate the ability to meet appropriate outcomes and scaling related efforts across the university, driving increased effectiveness and efficiency.

4P2d. Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analyses are conducted periodically throughout the year, to varying degrees and for varying University segments. Internally developed analyses often measure current university metrics against historical and projected metrics as well as against external benchmarks to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses; externally developed analyses often identify all SWOT components against historical and projected external benchmarks (Exhibit 4P2d.1: [Marketing - Eduventures Program SWOT Analysis - 2015](#)). These analyses inform many of the University's operational decisions and help support many of the initiatives identified in the strategic plan (Table 4P2d.1).

Strategic Theme	Initiative	SWOT Category	Source(s)	Rationale
Dynamic Learning	Increase Graduation Rates	Weakness	IPEDS	While graduation rates have been improving in recent years, there is opportunity for further improvement when compared to national and peer school averages (e.g., Kansas Independent Colleges Association (KICA) schools) (Exhibit 4P2d.1: Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018 (Page 19)).
				Various market analyses have

Robust Enrollment	Micro-credential Incubator	Opportunity	Eduventures and others	indicated specific market segments for micro-credentials (Exhibit 4P2d.2: Marketing - Eduventures Adult Prospect Survey Overview - 2017 (Page 30)). Internal expertise and existing programs can be used to develop several certificate and badge programs.
University-Wide Stewardship	Develop a revenue stream utilizing the Cybersecurity Lab	Strength	Environmental Scans, Business Partnerships	Friends developed a state-of-the-art cyber security lab in AY 2017-2018 to support our new cyber security degrees. Many local businesses have since expressed interest in receiving employee cyber security training through this facility.

4P2e. Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)

The SPSC has initially identified two initiatives within each cross-section of strategic theme and dimension (a total of 32 initiatives) for the University to begin implementing in AY 2018-2019. These initiatives were prioritized based upon anticipated gain for the University, availability of resources, and timing/sequencing of activities. Additional initiatives have also been identified and prioritized to commence upon the completion of existing initiatives (Exhibit 4P2e.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018](#)). All initiatives included in the strategic plan have defined funding and resources, will be supported by newly-raised funding/resources, or scheduled appropriately to allow funding and resources to become available. The SPSC meets monthly to review active and potential initiatives and adjusts the strategic plan as needed, including: adding new initiatives, reprioritizing initiatives as conditions change (e.g., in response to changing market dynamics, updated initiative scope, or updated initiative projections), and removing/canceling initiatives.

All initiatives are included within the University’s annual budget. As appropriate, select initiatives will be segmented within the budget and financial reporting to delineate between ongoing operational revenues/expenses and project revenues/expenses.

4P2f. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

Tracking of specific strategic initiatives are done initially by the initiative owners/departments associated with individual items and then accumulated for a holistic plan review. With the newly implemented strategic plan, all initiatives have an assigned success metric and timeline and are fed into a new dashboarding software, supported by Credo. This reporting will help facilitate discussion/progress updates at monthly SPSC meetings as well as with the Cabinet and the BOT.

4R2: What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution’s operational plans?

R&G Plan

The 3-year R&G Plan was segmented into four revitalization strategies and six growth strategies, with varying tactics under each strategy. Detailed review of R&G plan progress (Exhibit 4R2.1: [Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 \(Page 8\)](#)) indicate full or partial completion of all included strategies and tactics (Table 4R2.1):

Pillar	Strategy	Fully Completed Tactics	Partially Completed Tactics
Revitalization	Prioritize Academic and Administrative services	7	1
	Align fiscal resources to mission-essential programs and defined areas of opportunity	7	2
	Reduce budget shortfall to \$800,000 by 2017; show no deficit by 2018	4	3
	Rejuvenate programs that have capacity and a defined path for expansion	1	3
Growth	Develop new curricular programs which reflect market need	6	5
	Introduce strategic marketing and enrollment goals focused on recruitment	5	4
	Cultivate and Increase philanthropic support	3	3
	Increase retention rates at all levels	1	8
	Develop co-curricular offerings with strategic growth goals and targets	3	2
	Increase on-campus housing occupancy	3	1

4I2: Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Multi-Year Financial Plan

In conjunction with the Strategic Plan and FY 2018 budget processes, the University also created a 5-year financial plan. This plan incorporates specific goals for enrollment growth and new revenue streams in alignment with our strategic plan; scenario analyses also provide a range of enrollment and financial outcomes based on variability of key model inputs (Exhibit 4I2.1: [Strategy - Multi-Year Financial Plan - FY 2018-2022](#)). This plan will be reviewed annually by the Cabinet and BOT.

Vision

In AY 2017-2018, the University redefined its Vision to align with the newly implemented strategic plan. Our Vision – A Strong and Vibrant Future for Friends University – is rooted in four key elements (Exhibit 4I2.2: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 \(Page 24\)](#)):

- Formational: Impacting lives through Christian Spiritual Formation teaching and training
- National Recognition: Building academic excellence as we grow our unique programs for dynamic learning (Cyber and Technology, Zoo Science, Marriage and Family Therapy, Business and Global MBA)
- Engaging community: Becoming a more connected, authentic and winsome community
- Robust Enrollment Growth:
 - Strong residential community of 450 students
 - Vibrant student body of 1,000+ CBASE students
 - Strong CAPS and Grad programs with 1,200+ students

Sources

- Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018
- Institutional Research - Fact Book - Spring 2018 (page number 19)
- Marketing - Eduventures Adult Prospect Survey Overview - 2017
- Marketing - Eduventures Adult Prospect Survey Overview - 2017 (page number 30)
- Marketing - Eduventures Program SWOT Analysis - 2015
- Strategy - Friends Community Day Strategic Planning Feedback - AY 2017-2018
- Strategy - Multi-Year Financial Plan - FY 2018-2022
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 8)
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 (page number 8)
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 (page number 24)
- Strategy - Strategic Planning Process - AY 2017-2018
- Strategy - Strategic Planning Steering Committee - AY 2017-2018

4.3 - Leadership

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

4P3: PROCESSES

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

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

4R3: RESULTS

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

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

4I3: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

4P3a. Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)

Friends University is governed by a Board of Trustees (BOT) responsible for the University's

financial health and welfare, with authority affirmed through its general, academic, and financial policy-making functions. It respects and upholds the University's Mission, Vision, and Values, as adopted by the BOT itself. Membership includes between 15-30 individuals elected from the community at-large who are elected for three-year terms, in addition to the President, who serves as an ex-officio member; the BOT currently includes 20 members (Exhibit 4P3a.1: [Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 \(Page 4\)](#); Exhibit 4P3a.2: [Board of Trustees - Member List - AY 2017-2018](#)). The BOT and its standing committees meet at least three times per year to provide oversight of University functions (Exhibit 4P3a.3: [Board of Trustees - Meeting Schedule - FY 2018-2020](#)). University Officers (noted in section 4P3c) and administrators participate regularly in BOT and BOT Committee meetings; Faculty Senate and staff members are also invited to present to the BOT at each meeting.

4P3b. Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)

In addition to the general authority of the BOT described in section 4P3a, Articles X-XVIII of the Bylaws maintain eight standing committees within the BOT. Each standing committee shall have between three and seven members, all of whom, other than the president, shall be trustees, and will meet at least three times annually. The purposes of each committee in oversight of their area of responsibility are detailed in Articles X-XVIII of the Bylaws (Exhibit 4P3b.1: [Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 \(Page 9\)](#)):

- Executive Committee
- Committee on Trusteeship
- Academic Affairs Committee
- Student Affairs Committee
- University Advancement Committee
- Finance and Audit Committee
- Investment Committee
- Compensation and Conflicts Committee

Several additional policies support the selection of new board members and their continued participation on the BOT:

- As required by the Article XX of the Bylaws, the University maintains a Conflict of Interest policy for all board members and University Officers (Exhibit 4P3b.2: [Board of Trustees - Conflict of Interest Policy - 2000](#))
- New board members, University Officers, and key personnel must complete a Disclosure Questionnaire during their orientation to help review any potential conflicts of interest (Exhibit 4P3b.3: [Board of Trustees - Disclosure Questionnaire - 2017](#)). These individuals must also complete an Intermediate Sanctions policy during orientation to ensure that the University is operating to promote the educational opportunities of the community as a whole rather than to benefit their private interests (Exhibit 4P3b.4: [Board of Trustees - Intermediate Sanctions Policy - 2018](#)).
- Board members must also complete a disclosure form at orientation and annually thereafter to ensure the continuous review of potential conflicts of interest (Exhibit 4P3b.5: [Board of Trustees - Disclosure Form - 2000](#)).

4P3c. Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)

While Article III of the Bylaws does describe the ultimate oversight responsibility for the BOT,

Article VIII of the Bylaws describes the specific management responsibilities delegated to the University Officers (Exhibit 4P3c.1: [Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 \(Page 7\)](#)):

- The President is the chief executive officer of the University and shall be responsible for the supervision and management of the University, for the duties mandated by these Bylaws, and for interpreting and implementing the policies of the University and of the board, all subject to the ultimate authority of the board.
- The VP of Academic Affairs shall be the chief academic officer of the University.
- The VP of Finance shall be the chief financial officer of the University and shall be responsible for the operating and capital budgets, accounting and auditing, and such other financial responsibilities as required by the Bylaws of the University and by the board.

Faculty have chief responsibility for academic matters, as described by the Academic Governance process (noted in section 1P4a).

4P3d. Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments

The University currently uses multiple vehicles to ensure open communication, including a weekly University newsletter, bi-annual All Community meetings, an annual State of the University Address, and various meetings with the President. Faculty and staff are regularly invited to attend and participate in BOT and BOT Committee meetings and BOT reports are posted and available to all employees on the University's intranet. Additionally, regular faculty meetings and councils (as noted in section 4P3e) are attended by faculty from all colleges, administration, and appropriate staff, allowing for open communication of key academic matters.

4P3e. Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)

Within the academic function, collaboration within and across units is maintained through various means, including:

- Academic Affairs BOT Committee: Responsible for monitoring: learning goals and outcomes; program quality, institutional and program accreditation, and program review; policies and procedures related to faculty compensation, appointment, tenure, promotion, and performance; and the structure of the academic programs (Exhibit 4P3e.1: [Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 \(Page 10\)](#)).
- Academic Cabinet and Academic Councils (noted in section 1P4a): Preside over the academic governance of the University and its colleges, respectively (Exhibit 4P3e.2: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 59\)](#)).
- Faculty Senate: Represents the faculty in various settings to various constituencies (Exhibit 4P3e.3: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 43\)](#)).
- Regular faculty meetings (e.g., monthly General Faculty meetings, regular division and college meetings, and various committee meetings).

Cross-functional collaboration also occurs at multiple levels within the University, including:

- President's Cabinet and Cabinet Council: Ensure that appropriate student populations are being recruited, appropriate funding and resources are available to support students and programs, and co-curricular programs are supporting high academic standards.
- Between Faculty and Academic Support Services: Ensure that appropriate library resources are

available to support academic programs, appropriate tutoring staff and programs are available to support high-need students and courses, and appropriate career planning resources are available to support professional development.

- Between Institutional Research and other areas: Ensure that appropriate student learning assessment data, retention and completion data, and student feedback data (e.g., student satisfaction, student engagement, and student ratings of faculty instruction) are collected, analyzed, and reviewed by the institution.

4P3f. Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)

As described in Article XII of the Bylaws, the BOT Committee on Trusteeship ensures that the BOT provides effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders. This committee determines the most effective composition of the board and develops practices and policies that enhance BOT performance, including board member orientation and continuing education and also assesses BOT and board member performance.

The full range of BOT committees (noted in 4P3b) as well as the general authorities and illustrative functions noted in Article III of the Bylaws, including the express responsibility for the University's financial health and welfare, demonstrate the encompassing responsibility of the BOT to provide oversight to all institutional stakeholders.

4P3g. Developing leaders at all levels within the institution

The University invests in developing leaders within the institution through annual participation in the Willow Creek Global Leadership Summit (GLS) (Exhibit 4P3g.1: [The Global Leadership Summit - 2018](#)). Several high-potential members of the staff, faculty, and student body (Student Government Association members) are sponsored to attend the two-day summit along with the administrative team. At the GLS they learn from and interact with a variety of business leaders, entrepreneurs, and faith-leaders from around the world to enhance their own leadership styles.

Similarly, the University participates in the annual Kansas Independent College Association (KICA) Leadership Summit, hosting the event in AY 2017-2018 (Exhibit 4P3g.2: [KICA Leadership Summits - 2017](#)). Within these interactive leadership development summits, participants will learn from business leaders and experts in leadership theory, learn how to assess their leadership skills, and participate in exercises designed to enhance those skills.

The University also regularly supports leadership development through multiple on-campus leadership series. The President hosts several Leadership Conversations luncheons throughout the year, encouraging faculty and staff to come together and discuss leadership development. Religious, academic, and business leaders are invited to speak to the campus through our weekly Chapel events (Exhibit 4P3g.3: [Friends University Website - Chapel - 2018](#)). Additionally, the library sponsors a monthly series, Those Who Lead, Read, that engages members of the Friends University campus and the Wichita community with business leaders in a timely discussion about literacy and leadership (Exhibit 4P3g.4: [Friends University Website - Those Who Lead, Read Series - 2017](#)).

4P3h. Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)

The institution maintains a number of policies that ensure its ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision. As noted in section 4P3b, the BOT and University Officers sign a Conflict of Interest policy annually; compliance with this and the Intermediate Sanctions Policy are monitored by the BOT Compensation and Conflicts Committee. Additionally, the BOT has approved a Gift

Acceptance and Donor Recognition policy, monitored by the University Advancement Office. This policy ensures that there is no undue influence on the part of donors and that gifts are handled with consistency and in confluence with our mission and vision (Exhibit 4P3h.1: [Human Resources - Gift Acceptance Policies - 2016](#)). These policies preserve the BOT's independence from undue influence by external parties and ensure that the BOT makes decisions that are in the best interest of the institution.

4P3i. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The University measures the leadership effectiveness in multiple ways, including through Employee Satisfaction Surveys, President's 360 Performance Reviews, and participation in and qualitative feedback from leadership development seminars.

4R3: What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution?

President's 360 Performance Review

In AY 2017-2018, the BOT conducted a performance review for the University President, in her third year in this role. As part of this review, all of the President's direct reports, Co-Chairs of the Faculty Senate, and BOT members were asked to complete a confidential online evaluation of the President; the Faculty Senate Co-Chairs sought feedback from their colleagues to provide input into the evaluation survey. The President received an average rating of 4.58 (on a five-point scale) on all questions regarding leadership. Confidence in the President's ability to continue to provide excellent leadership to the institution was rated at 4.92 – the highest rated response of all questions. As a result of this evaluation, the President was extended an additional four-year contract.

Global Leadership Summit (GLS)

In 2016, 37 staff, faculty, and administrators attended the GLS. In 2017, participants increased to 60, with the added inclusion of 6 students. Post-event group discussion and feedback affirmed the value of attending the GLS (Exhibit 4R3.1: [Meeting Minutes - Global Leadership Summary Recap and Participant Feedback - 2017](#)).

4I3: Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Internal Communication Plan

In alignment with the Thriving Community theme of the University's newly implemented Strategic Plan, and in response to feedback from the recent Employee Satisfaction Survey (noted in section 3R2), the University has developed an Internal Communications Plan. This plan provides additional clarity to university employees regarding the various University-wide communication vehicles,

including their timing and where meeting minutes/recordings are stored (Exhibit 4I3.1: [Marketing - Internal Communication Plan - 2018](#)).

President's Process Improvements

Based on the feedback provided in the performance evaluation the President is implementing the following process improvements:

- Continue to participate in Higher Education conferences, meet with college presidents, and seek understanding of the challenges of higher education among small private institutions. Based on this feedback the President attended the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) President's Institute and the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) International Forum. The President will be a featured speaker at the CCCU Women's Leadership Institute in June 2018.
- Put more focus and attention towards the adult education programs at Friends University. Consider other educational delivery models to increase numbers and to evaluate program quality. Based on this feedback a number of task force groups have been evaluating various models using Online Program Management and have also been implementing new strategies for the adult programs.
- Continue to build relationships with faculty and staff with the goal of understanding the pressures and challenges in their areas and divisions. Develop opportunities to engage faculty and staff from different areas of the University to enhance community at Friends. Based on this feedback the President has initiated "Coffee with the President" to encourage deeper relationships and understanding among various departments. Additionally, the President hosts "Summer Connects" in the President's Office throughout the summer.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 43)
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 59)
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 (page number 3)
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 (page number 4)
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 (page number 7)
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 (page number 9)
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017 (page number 10)
- Board of Trustees - Conflict of Interest Policy - 2000
- Board of Trustees - Disclosure Form - 2000
- Board of Trustees - Disclosure Questionnaire - 2017
- Board of Trustees - Intermediate Sanctions Policy - 2018
- Board of Trustees - Meeting Schedule - FY 2018-2020
- Board of Trustees - Member List - AY 2017-2018
- Friends University Website - Chapel - 2018
- Friends University Website - Those Who Lead, Read Series - 2017
- Human Resources - Gift Acceptance Policies - 2016
- KICA Leadership Summits - 2017

- Marketing - Internal Communication Plan - 2018
- Meeting Minutes - Global Leadership Summary Recap and Participant Feedback - 2017
- The Global Leadership Summit - 2018

4.4 - Integrity

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

4P4: PROCESSES

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

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

4R4: RESULTS

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

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

4I4: IMPROVEMENT

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

Responses

4P4a. Developing and communicating standards

The Board of Trustees (BOT) maintains oversight for ensuring that the University develops and communicates appropriate institutional standards that ensure legal and ethical behavior. Responsibility for the development and communication of such standards is delegated to the President's Cabinet (primarily to the VPs of Academic Affairs, Administration, and Finance). President's Cabinet reviews and approves many of these standards, as developed by Cabinet-members

and their designees. Significant standards may be brought to various BOT Committees (e.g., the Academic Affairs, Compensation and Conflict, and Finance and Audit Committees) for review and approval, as noted in the Bylaws.

These policies and procedures are distributed to employees through various published documents including the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 4P4a.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018](#)), Student Handbook (Exhibit 4P4a.2: [Student Handbook](#)), Academic Catalog (Exhibit 4P4a.3: [Course Catalog](#)), Bylaws (Exhibit 4P4a.4: [Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017](#)), and individual Human Resources (HR) policies and procedures (Exhibit 4P4a.5: [Friends University Website - Human Resources Policies or Procedures - 2018](#)).

The University works in good faith to comply with all appropriate federal, state, and local laws as well as regional and specialized accreditation standards.

4P4b. Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution

Employee training to ensure legal and ethical behavior begins with New Hire Orientation (Exhibit 4P4b.1: [Human Resources - New Hire Orientation Checklist - 2017](#)). As part of this process, new employees complete several policy acknowledgements and trainings, including:

- Policy Acknowledgement Form (acknowledgement that employees have read all HR policies) (Exhibit 4P4b.2: [Human Resources - Policy Acknowledgement Form - 2010](#))
- Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit 4P4b.3: [Human Resources - Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement - 2018](#))
- HIPPA/FERPA training (Exhibit 4P4b.4: [Human Resources - FERPA-CISP-HIPPA Training - 2013](#))
- Sexual Harassment/Title IX training

Sexual Harassment/Title IX training is renewed annually by all employees. Updates to HR policies are automatically distributed to employees through SharePoint update notifications.

4P4c. Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A.)

All financial aid systems are audited annually by BKD, the University's independent auditors, the results of which are reported to the Department of Education (DOE). Federal Funds have many requirements to which the University complies that also help ensure integrity and ethical practices, including:

- Satisfactory student progress – students have to be enrolled in certain hours, those classes have to be relevant to their intended degree, and they have to maintain a certain GPA in order to receive or be eligible for federal funds.
- The Financial Aid Office is also required to be compliant with the DOE by checking to ensure that student and potential students are not in default on other loans.
- Students must be fully admitted to the University before funds are awarded, ensuring that federal funds are not diverted for other uses.
- Academic Aid packages are consistently awarded on the basis of GPA and ACT scores. Athletic and Fine Arts Aid packages are awarded based on specific performance (Exhibit 4P4c.1: [Finance - Fine Arts Scholarship Recommendation Forms - 2018](#); Exhibit

4P4c.2: [Finance - Athletic Scholarship Recommendation Form - 2018](#)).

Similarly, the University's financial statements and financial systems are audited annually by BKD. Current financial standards include:

- The Compensation and Conflict Committee annually reviews the vendor concentration report, which identifies vendors with whom Friends conducted business worth more than \$10,000.
- The Accounting department follows Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) proper internal controls, such as separation of duties with cash and reconciliations.
- The VP of Finance approves payroll before distribution.
- Two check signers, usually the VP of Finance and the VP of Administration, approve electronic wires.
- Signing authority policy governing who may sign which documents and contractually obligate the University for amounts greater than \$10,000 (Exhibit 4P4c.3: [Human Resources - Signing Authority Policy - 2016](#)).

Student academic information and integrity is protected through a variety of processes, including:

- Under FERPA, a student may allow access to their academic information.
- The Class Withdrawal form initiates a process that provides information to comply with federal requirements such as the Return of Title IV Funds (R2T4).
- Students complete an intent to graduate form, which triggers Registrar review of their coursework and verify degree completion. This information is reported to the National Student Loan Data System.

Personnel integrity is maintained through the HR policies and procedures noted in sections 4P4a and 4P4b.

4P4d. Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)

Initial disclosure of relevant University information is made available publicly through the University Website, including:

- Regional and specialized accreditation and state program approvals (Exhibit 4P4d.1: [Friends University Website - Accreditation - 2018](#)).
- Cost and financial aid information (Exhibit 4P4d.2: [Friends University Website - Costs & Financial Aid - 2018](#)).
- Full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, staff, and administration information, available in the directory and on individual program webpages.
- BOT relationship and control (Exhibit 4P4d.3: [Friends University Website - Connections & Partnerships - 2018](#)).
- Academic requirements, noted on the Admissions, academic program, and Academic Catalog webpages.

Additional information is made available to students during the application process and their tenure as a student, including:

- The Admissions Office provides student cost estimates at their on-campus visit, documenting it in their award letter, along with their estimated aid. Friends informs all students annually about the Terms and Conditions of their financial aid.

- Within Self-Service Banner (SSB), students have the ability to see their costs, financial aid, and loans. They can approve the amount of loans that they want within the SSB system. In addition to mandatory DOE loan counseling, we also discuss loans with the student before they finalize their enrollment.
- Students are required to sign the Student Payment Agreement (SPA) in person, which is often referred to as “finalizing”. Online students may complete the SPA by email.

4R4: What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity?

Annual Independent Auditor's Report findings have been minimal, with each finding resolved by the subsequent year's Independent Auditor's Report (Table 4R4.1) (Exhibit 4R4.1: [Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2017 \(Page 52\)](#); Exhibit 4R4.2: [Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2016 \(Page 52\)](#); Exhibit 4R4.3: [Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2015 \(Page 54\)](#)).

	Audit Year			
	FY2017	FY2016	FY2015	FY2014
Findings	1	2	0	1
Findings Resolved	0*	2	0	1

**Corrective Action Plan submitted to BKD to resolve finding for the FY2018 Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements (Exhibit 4R4.4: [Finance - Corrective Action Plan - FY2017](#))*

4I4: Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Financial Aid

In the summer of 2018 Friends will have a new Athletic Director and new Fine Arts Chairperson. The Financial Aid Office will be working with each of them to refine the financial aid process and help make the scholarship awarding process for both athletics and fine arts more efficient and equitable going forward.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Board of Trustees - Bylaws - 2017
- Finance - Athletic Scholarship Recommendation Form - 2018
- Finance - Corrective Action Plan - FY2017

- Finance - Fine Arts Scholarship Recommendation Forms - 2018
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2015
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2015 (page number 54)
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2016
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2016 (page number 52)
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2017
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2017 (page number 52)
- Friends University Website - Accreditation - 2018
- Friends University Website - Connections & Partnerships - 2018
- Friends University Website - Costs & Financial Aid - 2018
- Friends University Website - Human Resources Policies or Procedures - 2018
- Human Resources - Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement - 2018
- Human Resources - FERPA-CISP-HIPPA Training - 2013
- Human Resources - New Hire Orientation Checklist - 2017
- Human Resources - Policy Acknowledgement Form - 2010
- Human Resources - Signing Authority Policy - 2016

5 - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

5.1 - Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making
- Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively
- Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements
- Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

5R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

5I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P1a. Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making

The University collects a veritable cornucopia of data and performance information at varying levels within the organization to support its planning, process improvement, and decision making processes. Data are collected based on needs identified by President's Cabinet, the Board of Trustees (BOT), functional areas within the University (e.g., academic departments, enrollment management, and student support service areas), external requirements (e.g., IPEDS), and general best practices. Most data are organized within a few key systems. The University's Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, Banner, is the primary information system, housing student information, student finances and financial aid, University finances, and human resources data. Admissions funnel data are managed within our Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system, Salesforce, adopted in AY 2015-2016. Course and student performance information are housed within the University's Learning Management System (LMS), Moodle. A variety of additional systems are used to collect and manage data within the University. Various areas within the University have functional users responsible for data entry and integrity as well as reporting within these systems (e.g., enrollment management, financial aid, institutional research, and online learning); information is also managed centrally by the Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation.

Knowledge management practices have become increasingly transparent and adaptive for use at multiple levels within the organization. Performance data are routinely shared through various means, including Town Hall events, through frequent periodic university communications (e.g., Among Friends newsletter), periodic staff and faculty meetings, and published to intranet sites and local network drives. Information quality has improved in recent years through reporting that is generally more longitudinal in nature, aligned with goals and external performance standards, aggregated/disaggregated at varying levels, and integrated with multiple data sets.

Such data sets and performance information are used for planning purposes, including building annual enrollment and financial budgets and supporting the development of our strategic plan. Operational, these data sets and performance information are used to track progress towards periodic goals and identify opportunities for departmental process improvements and AQIP action projects.

5P1b. Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively

As noted in section 5P1a, data needs are determined by the individual units/departments themselves, University leadership, external requirements, and best-practices. Leadership and external requirements typically focus on annual/semester performance data. Each department/unit maintains appropriate processes to accumulate these data, such as:

- Finance has monthly and annual close processes to book and review financial entries in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and employs an external auditor for annual review of year-end financial statements. They also measure financial health against other institutions using NACUBO benchmarking (e.g., endowment return/growth).
- Institutional Research and Accreditation has a tri-annual census-day (20-day) process with Information Technology to capture enrollment information for internal (e.g., Fact Book) and external (e.g., IPEDS) reporting
- Enrollment Management and Institutional Research and Accreditation have processes leading into each academic term and subsequent census dates that track admissions funnel statistics by various stages, student types, and demographics

Individual departments also maintain systems and processes to appropriately manage day-to-day operational activities, such as:

- Enrollment management uses Salesforce to manage individual student leads and inquiries and progress students through to application, admission, and enrollment. These data are benchmarked against internal goals and historical activity to track progress and redirect focus, as necessary.
- Financial aid uses Banner to manage the awarding and acceptance of individual financial aid packages. These data are also accumulated to track discount rates (NACUBO and institutional aid rates) and measure against benchmarks and historical averages. Financial aid collaborates closely with other offices (e.g., Registrar, Institutional Research, Athletics, and Fine Arts) to ensure we are in compliance with all regulations.
- Marketing uses Converge Consulting to collect marketing campaign data for various academic programs advertised online. Monthly reports are provided to help gauge the effectiveness of these campaigns and inform how future campaigns are managed.

Key data sets, including much of the aforementioned, are also used in our strategic planning processes. Additional strategic data set involvement includes:

- Marketing partners with Eduventures to collect environmental scans of historical and projected market data to aid in reviewing the viability of existing programs and determining new programs to launch. Local, regional, and national data sets reviewed include: enrollment and graduation trends by program, market saturation for programs, employment trends by market and career type, and demographic changes (Exhibit 5P1b.1: [Marketing - Eduventures Adult Undergraduate and Graduate Program Prioritization - AY 2015-2016](#); Exhibit 5P1b.2: [Marketing - Masters in Organizational Leadership Competitor Profiles - 2015](#)).
- Institutional Research and Accreditation provides survey data to identify opportunities for program enhancement, resource allocation, and project prioritization (e.g., nationally normed Student Satisfaction Index (SSI) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data as well as locally developed graduation and alumni survey data).

5P1c. Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements

The aforementioned University information systems, and others used throughout the University, have ad hoc query and standard reporting capabilities that allow functional users to access data as needed. Additionally, the Information Technology (IT) department maintains a web reporting tool, WebFocus, which is linked to Banner and provides more user-friendly reporting for the general population. IT analysts work with functional users to create a variety of public and secure reports for use in operational and strategic objectives.

There are also several roles throughout the University that specialize in providing institutional data, such as:

- The Controller and Finance department produce monthly and periodic financial statements that are shared directly with President's Cabinet, Cabinet Council, the BOT, and other committees to monitor the financial viability and sustainability of the institution
- The Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation produces various reporting that is published to the intranet for University-wide distribution as well as being shared directly with specific departments/groups; this information guides decisions to improve the performance of

enrollment management, student support services, academics, career services, and a range of institutional priorities such as improving retention, graduation rates, and overall student success.

- The Registrar's office routinely provides students and faculty with degree audit information for advising and course planning through Degree Works (FalconMap) degree-auditing tool; faculty and staff can also access similar information through WebFocus reports
- The Salesforce Administrator and Enrollment department produce periodic admissions funnel reporting that are shared directly with President's Cabinet, Cabinet Council, the BOT, and other committees

5P1d. Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes

The institution's knowledge management systems are all supported by the IT department and/or external IT staff. These groups help ensure the physical availability of the systems to all users, perform routine system maintenance, and ensure that software versions are appropriately updated (Exhibit 5P1d.1: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018](#)).

IT uses various systematic and manual processes to ensure data integrity and accuracy. Data checks exist for various routine data loads to inform IT analysts of any failures. IT analysts also perform routine checks for data quality (e.g., as part of the census day reporting process and during the creation of new WebFocus reports). Data are also backed-up nightly for key systems (e.g., Banner) to prevent data loss.

IT security is managed primarily in one of two ways:

- System user access is granted directly by IT based on user or supervisor request; access to specific data modules is granted by IT based on approval by the appropriate functional owner (e.g., in granting Banner or WebFocus access).
- System user access is granted by a functional administrator who is given those rights by internal or external IT departments (e.g., in granting Salesforce or LiveText access).

Additionally, IT manages the purchase of user licenses for software and periodically reviews issued licenses for users that are inactive or may no longer need access, as applicable.

5P1e. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

As noted in sections 5P1a and 5P1c, the preponderance of University data is collected within the ERP system, Banner, and extracted directly or via the web-reporting tool, WebFocus. Other systems, including those noted above, are used to track and measure key data when IT and/or functional units identify additional needs for which a new system is required. The University uses both internally supported and contracted services to manage institutional data and performance information. When determining whether to manage data internally or through a contracted partner, multiple points are considered, including: current and future resource availability, expertise, system capabilities, cost, and overall system effectiveness.

5R1: What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution?

Select examples of data and performance results used in decision-making processes include (Table 5R1):

Table 5R1: Examples of Data and Performance Results Used in Decision-Making	
Data Source	Use in Decision-Making
Banner (Finance)	Supported improvement of Composite Financial Index (CFI) through detailed financial reporting and analysis
Eduventures Program Prioritization Reports	Supported decision to eliminate Human Resource Management and Organizational Leadership and Informational Change Adult Undergraduate degrees (moving instead to concentrations within the Business Management degree
Fact Book	Supported formation of Retention and Completion Committee and increased focus on retention
NSSE	Supported increased focus on High Impact Practices (HIPs) in strategic plans (e.g., increasing service-learning and internship opportunities)
Salesforce information	Supported creation of Falcon Fly-In Program (funding travel for prospective students to visit campus) due to high conversion rate of prospective students who visit campus.

5I1: Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Contribution Margin Analysis by Program

In AY 2017-2018 the Finance department began developing new reporting to identify revenue and profitability by academic department and performance team (e.g., athletics and fine arts). This reporting will be included as part of the new program review process and enhance our ability to review the viability of existing programs.

Integration RX

In AY 2017-2018 the Enrollment Management department implemented a new tool, Integration RX, to integrate admissions funnel data from Salesforce with enrolled student information in Banner. This system will allow them to better identify characteristics of students who matriculate into the University (and those who do not), better understand demographics of students who are attracted to individual programs, and more effectively target and manage recruiting efforts.

LMS Data Use in Retention Efforts

In AY 2017-2018, Academic Success Coaches (ASC) in our adult programs began reviewing weekly performance data from the LMS for anomalies such as erratic attendance, low or no grades on assignments, or other attributes that do not fit a successful student profile. Once reviewed, the ASC who supports a specific student will be in contact with him or her to offer support, guidance, information, and access to the Academic Resource Center for tutorial assistance. Data from this process are more timely and accurate than prior manually supplied instructor feedback and are a contributing factor to increased retention rates experienced in the adult undergraduate programs in Spring 2018.

Sources

- Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018
- Marketing - Eduventures Adult Undergraduate and Graduate Program Prioritization - AY 2015-2016
- Marketing - Masters in Organizational Leadership Competitor Profiles - 2015

5.2 - Resource Management

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)
- Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (5.A.3)
- Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R2: RESULTS

What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

5I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P2a. Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)

The University's fiscal infrastructure is maintained to support ongoing operations and required liquidity ratios as defined through our debt financing agreements (Exhibit 5P2a.1: [Finance - Compliance Certificate - 2017_12_31](#); Exhibit 5P2a.2: [Finance - Annual Line of Credit Update - 2017](#)). To fund operations, the University relies primarily on tuition revenue; additional material sources of income include: gift and pledge income, interest and dividends, investment income, and auxiliary enterprises income (Exhibit 5P2a.3: [Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial](#)

[Statements - 2017](#)). In maintaining the fiscal infrastructure, the university administration submits various policy proposals annually to committees within the Board of Trustees (BOT) for review and subsequently to the full BOT for approval. The Finance Audit Committee of the BOT manages financial guidelines for the university, including:

- Establishing annual tuition rates, room and board rates, student fees, and other service fees on the recommendation of President's Cabinet
- Defining the university's debt management policies
- Presiding over the annual Financial Audit

The Investment Committee of the BOT manage investment guidelines for the university, including:

- Defining the spending policy target rates of the Quasi and Permanent Endowment (Exhibit 5P2a.4: [Finance - Investment Policy Addendum - 2017](#))
- Approving the endowment asset investment policy (Exhibit 5P2a.5: [Finance - Account Investment Policy Statement - 2017](#))

Endowment investment assets are managed externally by Hirtle Callaghan, who provide quarterly activity statements for review by the CFO and the Investment Committee. Financial audits are performed by BKD, who provide an annual independent auditor's report and financial statements.

The physical infrastructure of the University is managed by the Business Operations (BO) department at the University's main campus; management of this function is outsourced at branch campus locations. The annual budget allocated to the physical infrastructure is sufficient to maintain all operational activities and routine maintenance. Additionally, a prioritized deferred maintenance/capital expenditure schedule is reviewed in the annual budgeting process, which identifies our largest physical risks and helps us appropriately manage and budget for larger maintenance and capital projects.

The Information Technology (IT) department works collaboratively with faculty, staff, and administration to ensure that they have the appropriate technology to support student learning and university operations. This infrastructure support includes:

- Ensuring adequate access to computers in offices, classrooms, and labs
- Maintaining the network infrastructure, including internet and wireless network, telecommunications, servers, and emergency communications networks
- Overseeing technology support contracts and warranties
- Managing the implementation, maintenance, upgrading, and end-user training of numerous IT systems

The annual budget process (and resulting University budget) also ensures that appropriate personnel are maintained across these and other departments to meet operational needs (Exhibit 5P2a.6: [Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018](#); Exhibit 5P2a.7: [Finance - Budget Book - FY 2017](#)).

Additionally, as noted in section 1P4b, the University's most recent Multi-Location Visit Institutional Report highlights that physical, technological, and instruction and student support services are adequate to meet students' needs (Exhibit 5P2a.8: [Academic Affairs - Friends University Multi-Location Visit Report - 2017](#)).

5P2b. Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging

needs (5.A.3)

Resource management goals have been reviewed annually since 2015 by the President's Cabinet and BOT against our Revitalization and Growth Plan to ensure appropriate alignment. These resource management goals will be similarly reviewed against our recently adopted Strategic Plan.

Financial goals are established annually through the budget process, including enrollment and tuition revenue, special event revenue, and university expenditures. Investment goals are established as noted in section 5P2a.

A principal avenue through which the IT department aligns goals with the university mission, resources, and needs is through the Banner Advisory Team (BAT). The BAT includes representatives from IT and each functional area across the university that uses Banner and meets monthly to review the support strategy for Banner and other interfaced systems (Exhibit 5P2b.1: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Services and Support Diagram - 2018](#)). IT staff are able to communicate upcoming technology upgrades, solicit end-user feedback regarding implementations and scheduling, and develop testing, training, and roll-out strategies related to future implementations. The BAT maintains a multi-year technology roadmap to support resource planning and project goal setting (Exhibit 5P2b.2: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018](#)).

The BO department seeks to support student, faculty, and staff needs expediently and economically. The BO office uses an energy management system, Metasys, to manage and reduce energy consumption throughout the University. Friends has made targeted efforts towards maintaining an eco-friendlier structure – reducing both ongoing energy consumption and maintenance costs – including the installment of grant-funded solar panels in AY 2015-2016 on the library.

5P2c. Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)

The primary method of resource allocation occurs during the annual budget process (noted in section 5P3). This process serves to identify key resources needed to achieve organizational goals and ensure that the necessary funding is available to the appropriate departments.

Additionally, the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) ensures that IT resources are sufficient for educational purposes (Exhibit 5P2c.1: [Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 \(Page 56\)](#)). The ATC includes faculty representatives from each college, administration, the Director of Online Learning, and IT representatives, and reviews current and upcoming academic technology needs of the programs across the university. This review process allows the IT department to appropriately support changing program needs and integrate these needs into the annual budget and IT plans. Technology recommendations developed through the ATC include:

- Development of computer labs necessary to support various academic programs
- Procurement of classroom video conference technology and training of staff to support new synchronized e-learning (SEL) courses
- Staffing and training of student workers to support classroom technology needs while classes are in session
- Enhancement of campus IT security in support of the Cyber Security programs seeking National Security Agency Center of Academic Excellence (NSA-CAE) certification

5P2d. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The aforementioned departments track resource management activity and efficiency through monthly and annual financial reporting from Banner and the Finance Office. Responsiveness and effectiveness of technology and facilities requests are tracked through helpdesk satisfaction surveys and work-order completion data provided through TrackIT. Additional decision-making measures are tracked by the respective departments, including project management indicators (i.e., schedule, cost, and quality), technology inventory management, wireless internet usage, and computer lab usage.

5R2: What are the results for resource management?

Fiscal infrastructure sufficiency is captured in the Finance Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Dashboard (Exhibit 5R2.1: [Finance - Finance Dashboard - FY 2017](#)). Summary analysis of select KPIs and their results are as follows (Table 5R2.1):

Table 5R2.1: Financial Dashboard KPIs			
KPI	Use	FY 2017 Result	Analysis
Fall 20-Day Enrollments	Measure of tuition revenue	1,564	Negative/neutral: Declining enrollments in recent years, through FY 2017, primarily in adult undergraduate. FY 2018 traditional undergraduate and graduate enrollment flat vs. FY 2017; adult undergraduate lower vs. FY 2017. Budgeted enrollment increase in FY 2019 based on recent improvements in retention, new student recruitment, and new program additions.
Composite Financial Index (CFI)	Overall measure of financial strength	4.7	Positive: Above threshold for sufficiency (3.0) and internal goal (3.9). Strongest result in past 5 years. Driven by improved Return on Net Assets (ROA) and Net Operating Revenue Change.
Freshman and Overall Discount Rates	Tuition discount rate for traditional undergraduates	55% and 52%	Negative: Above overall goal of 48.9%. Generally increasing discount rates over the past 5 years. Targeted freshman discount rate for FY 2019 is 50% (which will also contribute to a lower overall discount rate)
Total Return on Endowment	Measure of endowment investment asset policy effectiveness	12.1%	Positive: Above goal of 7.4%. Strongest result in past 5 years. Influenced by strong market and prudent investments. Increased returns will improve ability to fund operations.

Debt Burden	Measure of debt service to expenditures	5.9	Positive: Below goal of 6.0. Impacted by prudent, consistent debt repayments over past 5 years.
Instruction Expense/Total Expense	Measure of academic infrastructure funding	26%	Neutral: Similar to prior years.

IT infrastructure sufficiency is evidenced in part through the extensive list of Administrative Computing projects that have been successfully completed since 2015. These project completions include the implementation of a new Customer Relationship Management (CRM) application, Salesforce, and major upgrade to our web-reporting tool, WebFocus (Exhibit 5R2.1: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018](#)).

Through needs identified through the ATC to support new cyber-security programs, we have developed a state-of-the art cyber security lab.

Additionally, the University has completed nearly \$1.0M in deferred maintenance and capital expenditure FY2016 (Exhibit 5R2.2: [Finance - Capital Improvements Projects - FY 2016-2019](#)).

5I2: Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Degree Works (Falcon Map) Upgrade

The University is committed to upgrade to the newest version of Degree Works software in AY 2018-2019. This upgrade will allow Friends to more effectively track student progress towards degree-completion and predict demand for courses.

Internet Connectivity Upgrades

In AY 2017-2018 the IT department made significant upgrades to the internet connections and wireless access points for the main campus in AY 2017-2018; the Kansas City location will be upgraded in AY 2018-2019. The new infrastructure provides three significantly faster connection avenues for students, faculty/staff, and guests, which are reviewed monthly by IT (Exhibit 5I2.1: [Information Technology - Monthly Wireless Update - February 2018](#)). These projects were approved based on Help Desk ticket volume analysis (tickets specifically related to internet and wireless issues) and technology needs identified by the ATC (e.g., the development of SEL courses and the increased use of videoconferencing technology in the classroom).

TrackIT System Adoption for Work-Order Management

In AY 2017-2018, the Business Operations department migrated to a new work-order management system, TrackIT. This migration was a coordinated effort with IT, discontinuing the use of an outdated platform and adopting a work-order management system already being used by the IT Help Desk. This decision allowed us to consolidate systems, reduce resource management expenses, and leverage internal expertise.

Sources

- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018
- Academic Affairs - Faculty Handbook - AY 2017-2018 (page number 56)
- Academic Affairs - Friends University Multi-Location Visit Report - 2017
- Finance - Account Investment Policy Statement - 2017
- Finance - Annual Line of Credit Update - 2017
- Finance - Budget Book - FY 2017
- Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018
- Finance - Capital Improvements Projects - FY 2016-2019
- Finance - Compliance Certificate - 2017_12_31
- Finance - Finance Dashboard - FY 2017
- Finance - Independent Auditor's Report and Financial Statements - 2017
- Finance - Investment Policy Addendum - 2017
- Information Technology - Administrative Computing Services and Support Diagram - 2018
- Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018
- Information Technology - Monthly Wireless Update - February 2018

5.3 - Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals
- Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)
- Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

5I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P3a. Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

The University employs a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget process, whereby revenue and cost-center owners play an integral role in developing initial budget projections. The process is governed by the Budget Committee, which includes President's Cabinet, a Faculty Senate representative, Academic Deans, and other appropriate faculty/staff.

The budget cycle begins each Spring with Budget Committee reviews of the prior year's processes, opportunities for improvement, and budgetary goals for the upcoming academic year. Budget development is then opened to all budget managers via training sessions, which provide guidance on

the process as well as the budget and salary planning tools (Exhibit 5P3a.1: [Finance - Budget Justification Spreadsheet - FY2019](#)). Departmental budgets are then reviewed by the responsible Vice President, submitted to the Finance department and CFO for compilation, and then presented to the Budget Committee for review. The Budget Committee iteratively reviews the compiled University budget, making adjustments as necessary to appropriately fund strategic initiatives, optimize expenditures, and refine revenue projections (including review of retention rates, enrollment funnel activity, and new program launches/substantive program changes). Once the Budget Committee approves a final budget, it is submitted to the Finance Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees (BOT) for review and then to the BOT for approval (Exhibit 5P3a.2: [Finance - Budget Timeline - FY 2018](#); Exhibit 5P3a.3: [Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018](#)).

5P3b. Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)

The University's financial position is monitored regularly by University leadership. Monthly financial reports are prepared by the finance department and reviewed at President's Cabinet that detail financial activity to-date and compare to budget projections and prior year actuals to-date. This information is also reviewed with the BOT Finance Committee three times per year. This continual review process allows us to make adjustments to our current-year financial budget (e.g., reallocating resources or changing expenditure approvals) as well as to better forecast when building future-year budgets (Exhibit 5P3b.1: [Finance - Monthly Financial Statement - 2018-03-31](#); Exhibit 5P3b.2: [Finance - GASB Financial Statement - 2018 March](#)).

Tax form 990 and 990T are completed annually by the University's auditing firm after audit with assistance from finance staff. The BOT Finance Committee reviews prior to submission and a copy is sent to the entire BOT (Exhibit 5P3b.3: [Finance - Friends 990, 990-T, & K-120 - 2017-06-31](#)).

5P3c. Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

University data are preserved through nightly backups of Banner data by the Administrating Computing team. The Infrastructure team manages long-term backups of data through the creation of physical tapes, which are sent offsite for secure storage. In AY 2018-2019, they will transition from physical tape storage to SAN storage, provided by EMC Avamar, which will greatly increase storage capacity and reduce storage costs.

To ensure security of data, access to key systems (e.g., Banner and WebFocus) is granted by IT, with approval from defined department representatives. User access limitations include:

- Access to budget information through standard Banner cost-center reports for which the user is an owner or assigned delegate
- Access to reporting modules relevant to the users' role and responsibilities
- FERPA training requirements for all faculty and staff who interact with student data

Additionally, Banner 9, which will be implemented in AY 2018-2019, will improve system security through more comprehensive password protection and enterprise single sign-on for all Banner products and other related systems in later phases (e.g., WebFocus).

Technology reliability and security are maintained through appropriate support and upgrade processes. Campus computers are upgraded on four-year cycles and extended warranties are maintained for all network servers. Additionally, ongoing support contracts are maintained for all software/applications (Exhibit 5P3c.1: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Services and Support Diagram - 2018](#)).

Information Technology (IT) maintains a Help Desk that is open during normal business hours and available on-call after business hours for emergencies. IT student-workers are also staffed in the library and Business & Technology building to support students and instructors during evening classes. Help Desk requests and survey feedback are monitored to support decision-making (e.g., supporting the wireless internet infrastructure upgrade) and to ensure effective training and publication of user guides (Exhibit 5P3c.2: [Friends University Website - Technology - 2018](#)). Additional Help Desk support is available from 3rd party providers (e.g., The LearningHouse for LMS support).

5P3d. Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

As noted in section 5P2, the Business Operations (BO) department directly manages the physical infrastructure of our main campus location; branch locations are indirectly managed through relationships established in our leasing agreements. As part of this structure, campus buildings are routinely maintained to ensure safety, comfort, functionality, and appropriate use in student learning. Infrastructure reliability is increased through redundant utility systems (e.g., multiple coolers and boilers function on a loop to provide air conditioning and heat to campus buildings). Deferred maintenance and capital expenditure projects are identified, prioritized, risk-adjusted, and addressed annually, as funding allows. As noted in section 5I2, the maintenance work-order system, TrackIT, allows the BO department to ensure timelines and effectiveness of maintenance request completion; reporting from this system also informs the prioritization of maintenance projects. The BO department also partners with the ADA office to update facilities to appropriately accommodate student, faculty, and staff needs.

Campus safety is addressed by several groups and processes, which are addressed in multiple settings, including new student orientations and mandatory residence life meetings, published to the University website, and included in classrooms and other key work areas (Exhibit 5P3d.1: [Friends University Website - Security - 2018](#)). The Security department maintains a physical presence on campus 24/7, actively patrolling the campus, buildings, and residence halls, providing escorts on campus, and responding to any incident. Campus buildings include life safety equipment that are all regularly inspected and maintained. Backup batteries/generators are in place in all buildings to ensure fire alarm system functionality in the event of a power loss. Residence halls also have added security systems, including:

- Resident Assistants on duty 24/7 and professional staff on duty or on-call 24/7
- Secured entrances, requiring student access keys for entry after 5:00 PM and all weekend
- Key card tracking systems to identify and record building access

5P3e. Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

There are numerous risk mitigation processes in place to ensure operational stability. Fiscal risks are addressed through the inclusion of contingency funding in the annual budget, maintaining adequate cash reserve balances and liquidity ratios, and the development of multiple scenario financial plans (e.g., expected case and upside/downside cases). The University also maintains insurance policies to address catastrophic incidents. Technological risks are addressed as noted above in section 5P3c as well as through policies including PCI and FERPA. IT also maintains a backup generator to keep systems functioning in a power outage.

Emergency preparedness is addressed in the university's Critical Incident Management (CIM) Plan (Exhibit 5P3e.1: [Miscellaneous - Critical Incident Management Plan - 2018](#)). The CIM Plan defines the process for responding to natural disasters, fires, active shooter situations, and other critical

incidents. As part of the CIM, each campus building also has building captains who are trained annually to respond to all incidents noted in the CIM and assist with the initial critical incident response in their assigned building. All faculty, staff, and students participate in bi-annual emergency preparedness drills (e.g., weather and fire). Faculty and staff also participate in annual active shooter training; several key employees also participate in periodic countywide active shooter simulations. Additionally, all faculty, staff, and students are automatically enrolled in our Falcon Alert emergency notification system, which sends email and text alerts of critical incidents and emergency situations.

5P3f. Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

All financial data are managed in Banner (e.g., tuition, payables, payroll, debt) and is either extracted directly from Banner for reporting or via WebFocus reporting. All budget managers can query Banner to review financial data for their areas of responsibility (e.g., actuals, budget, encumbered expenses, and prior period financials). All finances are recorded in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP); the University uses fund accounting to track unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted funds separately.

IT and facilities activities related to work-orders are tracked through TrackIT. Additional systems and reporting are used to measure other key outcomes.

5R3: What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future?

Budget

The University’s operating budget has improved in each of the past four years, with a balanced budget projected for FY2019 (Table 5R3.1; Exhibit 5R3.1: [Finance - Operating Budget Compilation - FY2015-2019](#)). These results indicate improving financial performance, more accurate forecasting models/processes, and the ability to maintain and potentially increase cash reserve balances.

	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
Total Revenue (budget)	\$30.8	\$28.0	\$28.3	\$26.8	\$26.5
Total Revenue (actual)	\$28.7	\$26.9	\$25.2		
Total Expense (budget)	(\$35.7)	(\$30.5)	(\$29.1)	(\$27.0)	(\$26.5)
Total Expense (actual)	(\$31.1)	(\$28.1)	(\$26.0)		
Net Income (budget)	(\$4.9)	(\$2.5)	(\$0.8)	(\$0.2)	\$0.0
Net Income (actual)	(\$2.4)	(\$1.3)	(\$0.8)		

Helpdesk Satisfaction

Helpdesk satisfaction has been consistently strong, as noted through quality and timeliness of issue resolution, indicating appropriate staffing and training of helpdesk personnel (Table 5R3.2; Exhibit 5R3.2: [Information Technology - Helpdesk Survey - 2017](#)).

Table 5R3.2: Helpdesk Satisfaction						
	2015		2016		2017	
The length of time taken to close this work order was acceptable.*	96%	66	91%	71	95%	96
I was pleased with the overall quality of service I received for this work order.*	96%	66	95%	74	95%	95
<i>*Respondents noting "strongly agree" or "agree"</i>						

5I3: Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

IT Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

In FY2019, the IT department will initiate two significant RFPs impacting our technology infrastructure:

- Security Assessment RFP to identify risks of infrastructure and overall IT environment, potentially resulting in additional policy implementation and/or investment in IT security
- Learning Management System (LMS) RFP to compare our current provider with alternative providers for our current hosting model as well as a more comprehensive hosting model for online student management

Sources

- Finance - Budget Book - FY 2018
- Finance - Budget Justification Spreadsheet - FY2019
- Finance - Budget Timeline - FY 2018
- Finance - Friends 990, 990-T, & K-120 - 2017-06-31
- Finance - GASB Financial Statement - 2018 March
- Finance - Monthly Financial Statement - 2018-03-31
- Finance - Operating Budget Compilation - FY2015-2019
- Friends University Website - Security - 2018
- Friends University Website - Technology - 2018
- Information Technology - Administrative Computing Services and Support Diagram - 2018
- Information Technology - Helpdesk Survey - 2017
- Miscellaneous - Critical Incident Management Plan - 2018

6 - Quality Overview

6.1 - Quality Improvement Initiatives

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives
- Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

6R1: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I1

Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P1a. Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

Action Projects

Friends has completed a wide range of Actions Projects, selected based on the need to address strategic priorities, Systems Appraisal feedback, Systems Portfolio opportunities, and/or other key operational initiatives. Decisions regarding which projects to undertake are typically made by the VP of Academic Affairs and other members of President's Cabinet, with input from faculty and staff from across the University. Projects not selected to become Action Projects may be canceled, deferred until the next cycle or, in many cases, implemented as other CQI initiatives. Status updates and project completion results are shared regularly with leadership, faculty, and other University stakeholders; in certain instances, some project results may also be shared within the community (e.g., components of The Hispanic Initiative).

Strategy Forum

The University views the Strategy Forum as an opportunity to not only develop an upcoming Action Project, but also to stay current with best practices in continuous quality improvement (CQI) and deepen the exposure to CQI among our faculty and staff. The University's strategy forum teams are cross-functional groups comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators who are not only charged with successfully completing the project developed at the forum, but with more broadly spreading and cultivating a continuous improvement culture among their colleagues. Prior to attending the Strategy Forum, the team meets to review recent Action Projects, Systems Portfolio/Systems Appraisal documents, and current strategic initiatives to identify key areas of opportunity for an Action Project to develop at the Strategy Forum.

Systems Portfolio

The Systems Portfolio cycle affords great opportunity to review, reflect upon, develop, and promote CQI efforts within Friends. The University's current efforts have been led by a cross-functional Systems Portfolio team, comprised of the VP Academic Affairs, VP of Student Affairs, VP of Finance, 3 Faculty members, and Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. Review of prior Systems Appraisal information has driven many of the recent and upcoming strategic initiatives (e.g., enhancing the use of direct assessment of learning outcomes, as noted in the University's new General Education Assessment model). For the past year, members of this team have met with faculty and staff spanning functions across the University intentionally championing the CQI culture more than ever before. The breadth and depth of involvement by the campus community is greater than in previous cycles, providing community members with more visibility to how their efforts relate to HLC accreditation as well as increasing ownership for maintaining accreditation (Exhibit 6P1a.1: [CQI - Category 2.2 - Portfolio Evidence template - 2017](#)).

6P1b. Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

While the above efforts are critical components to the University's success, Friends recognizes that a CQI culture necessitates continuous improvement at all levels. The University relies heavily on communication and transparency to inform and ensure integration of more localized efforts, larger University-wide initiatives, and the University strategy. University leadership communicates strategic and CQI efforts to faculty and staff through regular town halls, faculty retreats and general faculty meetings, departmental meetings, and weekly University newsletters. An expanded University leadership team, Cabinet Council, was created in AY 2017-2018 to provide a broader knowledge base and communication platform to collaboratively plan and review strategic and CQI initiatives (Exhibit 6P1b.1: [Strategy - New Cabinet and Cabinet Council Structure - 2017](#)). This structure ensures that as faculty and staff work with their Deans and functional leaders, their CQI initiatives can be aligned with and integrated into the overall CQR framework. Similarly, these leadership and communication frameworks help ensure strategic alignment when groups partner cross-functionally to collaborate on various initiatives (e.g., Financial Aid leadership working with fine arts faculty and athletic coaches to define and implement scholarship strategies to improve enrollment and retention, and Enrollment Management leadership partnering with faculty on new recruitment strategies for academic scholarship students). Furthermore, University and programmatic data are much more robust and readily available than in years past, helping guide CQI focus and more quickly interpret CQI outcomes.

6R1: What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?

Action Projects

Recruitment & Retention: The Hispanic Initiative

This action project was initiated in conjunction with the University’s Revitalization & Growth Plan (Exhibit 6R1.1: [Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 \(Page 11\)](#)), with the desire to increase traditional undergraduate recruitment, enrollment, and retention (Exhibit 6R1.2: [CQI - Action Project Submission and Review - The Hispanic Initiative - 2017](#)).

Hispanic enrollment has increased dramatically since undertaking this action project. Fall 2017 saw high enrollment marks for Full-time Traditional Undergraduates (FT TUG), First time Full-time Traditional Undergraduates (FT FT TUG), and Non-First time Full-time Traditional Undergraduates (NFT FT TUG) in both student count and percentage of the total TUG population (Table 6R1.1). Hispanic retention has shown mixed results with NFT FT retention outpacing the total TUG population, but FT FT retention lagging the total TUG population (Table 6R1.2). Retention will continue to be addressed through programming aimed at our Hispanic population.

Table 6R1.1: Hispanic enrollment trends and comparisons to TUG enrollment

	Fall 2017	% of total TUG	Fall 2016	% of total TUG	Fall 2015	% of total TUG	Fall 2014	% of total TUG
FT TUG Enrollment	87	11%	53	7%	50	6%	32	4%
FT FT TUG Enrollment	16	9%	12	8%	9	6%	6	3%
NFT FT TUG Enrollment	18	16%	10	9%	15	12%	6	6%

Table 6R1.2: Hispanic retention trends and comparisons to TUG retention

	Fall 2017	Fall 2016	Fall 2015	Fall 2014	Fall 2013
Hispanic FT FT Initial Cohort size	16	12	9	6	8
Hispanic FT FT Fall-to-Spring Retention	88%	75%	89%	83%	88%
Hispanic FT FT Fall-to-Fall Retention		58%	67%	50%	75%
TUG FT FT Fall-to-Spring Retention	91%	90%	84%	89%	88%
TUG FT FT Fall-to-Fall Retention		75%	63%	64%	71%

Hispanic NFT FT Initial Cohort Size	18	10	15	6	3
Hispanic NFT FT Fall-to-Spring Retention	94%	90%	80%	100%	100%
Hispanic NFT FT Fall-to-Fall Retention		90%	67%	83%	100%
TUG NFT FT Fall-to-Spring Retention	93%	92%	84%	83%	85%
TUG NFT FT Fall-to-Fall Retention		705	65%	59%	68%

In addition to these measures, this project also helped the University establish several programs for Hispanic students including a chapter of the Hispanic American Leadership Organization (HALO) and an internally-developed Latino Leaders programs. These programs provide opportunities for members to experience service-learning and community engagement and to develop their leadership skills, each of which contribute to improved enrollment and retention and align with our University Mission.

Effective Curricular Governance

This action project was also initiated in conjunction with the University’s Revitalization & Growth Plan, with the desire to standardize the curricular review process and streamline the curricular approval processes. This change allows faculty and administrators to more efficiently use their time, more quickly respond to changing curriculum needs, and more expeditiously launch new programs (Exhibit 6R1.3: [CQI - Action Project Submission - Effective Curricular Governance - 2018](#)).

During AYs 2016-2018, members of the faculty, college Deans, VP of Academic Affairs, and University Registrar worked collaboratively to evaluate and restructure the curricular governance policies and processes for the faculty handbook. Specific processes streamlined include catalog, course, and program revisions, new course approval, and new program approval. From these reviews, the University was able to remove up to two levels of approval from most curricular decisions and to improve the sequencing of information flow. Additionally, a new University Executive Curriculum Committee was created to oversee the curricular review process and advance academic and intellectual excellence across the University’s Faculty and academic programs (Exhibit 6R1.4: [CQI - AQIP Program Curriculum Change Process - 2018](#)).

These process changes will go into effect in AY 2018-2019, aligning with the enhancement and expansion of the program review process.

Strategy Forum

Teaching Effectiveness: Embracing Student Rating of Faculty Instruction

This action project was initiated at the 2017 AQIP Strategy Forum, with the desire to improve our faculty review and promotion & tenure processes as well as to bolster University performance relative to AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn (Exhibit 6R1.5: [CQI - Action Project Submission - Teaching Effectiveness - 2018](#)).

Four key areas of improvement were identified within this project (progress to date also noted):

1. Increase faculty awareness of the importance of and benefits of using the IDEA student ratings of faculty instruction
 1. Discussions led by Faculty, VP of Academic Affairs and Director of institutional Research and Accreditation have been held on multiple occasions including at University and college faculty meetings and faculty retreats
2. Increase response rate for IDEA surveys
 1. Increased response rate for traditional undergraduates from 49% (1,383 of 2,845) in Spring 2016 to 61% (2,188 of 3,568) in Fall 2017
 2. Increased response rate for adult students from 30% (715 of 2,411) in Spring 2016 to 40% (756 of 1,882) in Fall 2017
3. Develop an environment of collegiality among faculty and administration regarding sharing IDEA feedback and collaboratively identifying ways to improve teaching effectiveness
4. Incorporate more robust IDEA information into faculty performance and promotion & tenure review processes
 1. Updates to promotion & tenure process have been approved, requiring 3 years of full survey data submission by applicants
 2. Updates to annual faculty performance review process have been approved, requiring complete set of survey data submission (previously only two were required)

Furthermore, in addition to the online IDEA dashboards that are updated after each administration/academic term, Friends has developed new robust reporting for faculty and administration use in self-reflection and resource allocation. Longitudinal faculty reports have been created and individually distributed to all full-time faculty, in addition to longitudinal program-level reports and various other college-level segmentations (Exhibit 6R1.6: [Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017](#)).

Additional CQR Efforts

Additional CQR efforts and results are noted in section 6R2.

6I1: Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Strategic Plan

Upon completion of the 3-year Revitalization & Growth Plan, Friends University developed a new Strategic Plan in AY 2017-2018 (described in section 4P2). Within this plan, 32 initiatives were developed across four strategic themes and four dimensions that these themes will address (Exhibit 6I1.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 \(Page 8\)](#); Exhibit 6I1.2: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018](#)). These initiatives include both new projects as well as CQI efforts targeted towards existing processes, including:

- Dynamic Learning: Faculty Evaluation System (this is also an extension of the AQIP Action

Project developed at the 2017 Strategy forum)

- Dynamic Learning: Specific Strategies to Increase Graduation Rates
- Dynamic Learning: Taskforce to Develop Comprehensive Online Strategy
- Robust Enrollment: Strategic Management Plan

Sources

- CQI - Action Project Submission - Effective Curricular Governance - 2018
- CQI - Action Project Submission - Teaching Effectiveness - 2018
- CQI - Action Project Submission and Review - The Hispanic Initiative - 2017
- CQI - AQIP Program Curriculum Change Process - 2018
- CQI - Category 2.2 - Portfolio Evidence template - 2017
- Institutional Research - IDEA Longitudinal Report - Fall 2017
- Strategy - New Cabinet and Cabinet Council Structure - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017
- Strategy - Revitalization and Growth Packet - 2017 (page number 11)
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Presentation - 2018 (page number 8)

6.2 - Culture of Quality

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2: PROCESSES

Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality
- Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)
- Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)
- Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

6R2: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P2a. Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality

Leaders representing each function within the university serve on committees that oversee institutional operations, strategies, and resource allocation (e.g., Budget Committee, President's Cabinet, and the newly created Cabinet Council (Exhibit 6P2a.1: [Strategy - New Cabinet and Cabinet Council Structure - 2017](#)). These teams are able to align larger CQI initiatives with the University Mission as well as providing guidance and support to members of their functional areas to ensure that more locally developed CQI efforts also have strong missional alignment. This structure ensures that during annual budgeting cycles, CQI initiatives identified at any level in the University that require funding can be vetted and prioritized against other efforts to ensure the most efficient and effective allocation of resources; items not funded in a budgeting cycle may be deferred for re-evaluation at the next budget cycle or rejected. This structure also ensures that during a strategic planning cycle, the highest priority CQI initiatives can be identified and appropriately funded. Additionally, the transparent and collaborative nature of this system helps us execute initiatives in ways that are

scalable across the University (e.g., the use of Qualtrics as a common survey tool for academic programs and other departments and the purchase of LiveText AIS for university-wide assessment and program-review).

6P2b. Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)

In the past three years, the University's new President and leadership team have been instrumental in championing the CQI culture within the institution. They have solidified the institution's Mission and Values, identified short- and long-term priorities for success through the Revitalization and Growth Plan, and empowered faculty and staff to develop CQI initiatives to help the University fulfill its Mission. Similarly, a CQI culture is evident in many of the initiatives that are part of the newly developed Strategic Plan (Exhibit 6P2b.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018](#)). Evidence of CQI involvement and success exists at all levels and within all areas of the University:

- Curricular programs have been redesigned by faculty (e.g., the modification of the traditional undergraduate Spanish major into a Translation and Interpretation major based on review of changing market demand and the reformulation of the Religion and Philosophy undergraduate major into multiple credit-bearing offerings based on review of changing student demand and the need for resource optimization)
- Use of technology has accelerated to meet growing demand for online and hybrid programs (e.g., the investment in new video conferencing software and equipment in the classroom and the development of a Synchronous E-learning course modality)
- External partnerships have been established and strengthened to improve internal processes and develop new operational priorities (e.g., Enrollment Management and Ruffalo Noel Levitz improving financial aid discounting processes and recruiting strategies)
- Assessment methods have been redesigned to align with best-practices and respond to prior AQIP feedback (e.g., the movement towards direct assessment of course-embedded artifacts)
- Enhancement of various programs aimed at improving retention and completion (e.g., First-Year mentors, first-year orientation, and Friends Experience) by the newly formed Retention and Completion Committee

In all of this, there is a heightened sense of urgency and greater willingness – if not expectation – of faculty and staff to challenge the status quo and optimize processes, as the University strives to better serve student needs.

Supporting this, the institution has developed a more mature and pervasive data-informed decision-making culture. The creation of a Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation position has provided the University with a new resource for data analysis and centralization of information. Key institutional data sets (e.g., enrollment, retention, and completion data, student learning outcome assessments, student satisfaction surveys, and student ratings of faculty effectiveness) are now more actively disseminated and readily available to the campus community, facilitating more transparent conversations among faculty, staff, and administration. Reporting related to these data are iterative in nature and adapt each cycle based upon proactive feedback from internal partners. Additionally, there is an increasing focus on using data that is longitudinal, internally and externally comparative, and goal-oriented. These attributes help identify opportunities for CQI initiatives, measure the effectiveness of these initiatives, and further the CQI cycle.

6P2c. Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)

Many of the CQI initiatives are created in response to information presented in the aforementioned key institutional data sets. Each of these data sets are collected at regularly scheduled intervals, allowing institutional members to review the impact of changes made during previous cycles. Doing so indicates whether or not a particular CQI or implementation method was successful and precipitate additional change.

Several examples exist demonstrating the integration of prior CQI experiences with new CQI efforts, including:

- Recent iterations of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administration and University Fact Book included the peer group identified through previous AQIP action project as a new comparison group
- When seeking to highlight a prior successful Action Project for the Strategy Forum, the team reviewed all prior action projects and determined that the selected project was most successful due to robust communication efforts and leadership support – we now more intentionally seek to leverage these success strategies with all new action projects and CQI efforts
- Periodic events, such as the annual budget/planning process, routinely begin with discussion of best practices and lessons learned from prior cycles (Exhibit 6P2c.1: [Meeting Minutes - Budget Committee - 2018-01-22](#))
- Similarly, more episodic events, such as IT software upgrades, incorporate feedback from prior upgrade efforts and vendor best-practices (Exhibit 6P2c.2: [Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018](#))

6P2d. Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

The University's success in this area again begins with a commitment from leadership, led by members of the President's Cabinet, to champion the AQIP Pathway. Leaders participate fully in the various AQIP processes as well as empower various faculty and staff members to become change-agents for this cause, providing the appropriate freedom and autonomy to make decisions, while also holding employees accountable for their actions and results.

Highlighting this holistic commitment, our most recent Strategy Forum team was comprised of our President, VP of Academic Affairs, VP of Finance, Assistant Dean, Director of Residence Life, Graduate and Undergraduate Faculty, and Director of Institutional Research and Accreditation. Similar representation exists on the Systems Portfolio team, allowing multiple voices to reaffirm the vitality of the AQIP Pathway and communicate with their peers everyone's role in contributing to the University's success as an AQIP institution. The value of this approach has been evident as specific faculty have helped gain broader support for our Strategy Forum Project – Teaching Effectiveness: Embracing Student Rating of Faculty Instruction (Exhibit 6P2d.1: [CQI - Action Project Submission - Teaching Effectiveness - 2018](#)). Additionally, the entire Systems Portfolio process has provided numerous opportunities for the Systems Portfolio team to reaffirm to the University community that each individual and department plays an integral role in the CQI culture.

6R2: What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?

There are a plethora of successful CQI initiatives included throughout the Systems Portfolio and on

record throughout the University. Select examples include:

- Growth in Spanish majors from Fall 2015 (5 1st majors and 15 2nd majors) to Fall 2017 (13 1st majors and 14 2nd majors)
- Development of a 20 credit-hour certificate and 32 credit-hour 2nd major in Christian Spiritual Formation along with the elimination of a 15 credit-hour concentration requirement for the Religion and Philosophy major, adding flexibility to curricular offerings and allowing faculty resources to be re-directed to other programs
- Enacted changes within the Registrar's office to adopt a more streamlined self-registration process for adult undergraduate and graduate students and launch DegreeWorks, an academic advising and degree audit tool that helps students and their advisors successfully navigate curriculum
- Upgrade of WebFocus reporting tool to capitalize on more advanced web reporting and delivery features
- Second year retention improvements for First-time Full time undergraduate students in the University's top three academic scholarship levels through moderating GPA thresholds for maintaining scholarships: 81% (109 of 134) for the Fall 2016 cohort, up from 65% (83 of 128) for the Fall 2015 cohort
- Development of the Falcon Fly-in Program, which uses innovation grant funds to bring prospective high school seniors on site for high-yield campus visits; first-year success has resulted in expanded scope, now including high school juniors and student groups.
- Creation of the Adopt-a-Student Initiative, a program redirecting and focusing faculty recruitment efforts to personal recruitment of select core students (non-athletes and non-fine arts performers)
- Enhancement of the University's Learning Management System to record assessment of our General Education program as well as business programs in preparation for future ACBSP accreditation efforts
- Piloting of learning communities for select academic programs through the freshman seminar course (Friends Experience) and freshman housing
- Re-institution of weekly chapel services to more intentionally integrate students' spiritual lives with their academic and social lives

6I2: Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

As noted in section 6P1, increased commitment to quality and CQI from the University's new leadership and key faculty and staff members in the past three years have improved the attitude of faculty and staff regarding CQI initiatives. Through the Revitalization and Growth phase Friends has become increasingly willing to review existing processes as it strives to fulfill its Mission and Vision. A new University-wide program review process has been instituted (beginning in AY 2017-2018) to improve the quality of existing programs. External partnerships have been enhanced to accelerate the adoption of new programs, such as partnering with Eduventures to understand market opportunities in:

- Launching undergraduate and graduate cyber security degrees
- Developing an undergraduate mechanical engineering degree

- Adding a finance concentration within the MBA degree
- Eliminating a business analytics concentration within the MBA degree
- Transitioning the HR undergraduate major into a concentration within the business management major

The University has also increasingly demonstrated that stakeholder feedback matters. Friends is more intently focused on student feedback, making adjustments to programs, teaching methods, student support structures, and resource allocation based on survey instruments such as Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Adult Student Priority Survey (ASPS), NSSE, graduation survey, alumni survey, and IDEA Student Ratings of Faculty Instruction. Faculty and co-curricular staff also create and use program-specific survey instruments to make improvements to their programs. Similarly, the University launched an Employee Satisfaction Survey in Spring 2018, following the completion of the Revitalization and Growth Plan, the results of which are incorporated into the Thriving Community theme of the new Strategic Plan.

More specific programmatic and structural changes are currently being evaluated as part of the new Strategic Plan development. Future CQI initiatives will include emphases on improved academic assessment and High-Impact Practices within our Dynamic Learning theme as well as increased innovation in program offerings and modalities within our Robust Enrollment theme (Exhibit 6I2.1: [Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018](#)).

Sources

- CQI - Action Project Submission - Teaching Effectiveness - 2018
- Information Technology - Administrative Computing Technology Roadmap - 2018
- Meeting Minutes - Budget Committee - 2018-01-22
- Strategy - New Cabinet and Cabinet Council Structure - 2017
- Strategy - Strategic Plan Initiative Spreadsheet - 2018