



Open Pathway Quality Initiative Proposal Review Form

Date of Review: January 8, 2014

Name of Institution: Creighton University

State: Nebraska

Institutional ID: 1482

Reviewers (names, titles, institutions): Donald L. Feke
Vice Provost for
Undergraduate Education
Case Western Reserve Univ.

Joseph P. Frizado
Interim Dean, College of Technology,
Architecture & Applied Engineering
Bowling Green State University

Review Categories and Findings

1. Sufficiency of the Initiative's Scope and Significance

- ◆ Potential for significant impact on the institution and its academic quality
- ◆ Alignment with the institution's mission and vision
- ◆ Connection with the institution's planning processes
- ◆ Evidence of significance and relevance at this time

Finding:

The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates acceptable scope and significance.

The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate acceptable scope and significance.

Rationale and Comments: (Provide two to three statements justifying the finding and recommending minor modifications, if applicable. Provide any comments, such as highlighting strong points, raising minor concerns or cautions, or identifying questions.)

Creighton's proposed QI project is intended to strengthen the institution's ability to build academic quality and to connect planning for its programs directly to the institution's mission. The project is timely, and may even be considered to be overdue, since regular review of academic programs should be a routine part of the manner in which universities operate.

2. Clarity of the Initiative's Purpose

- ◆ Clear purposes and goals reflective of the scope and significance of the initiative
- ◆ Defined milestones and intended goals
- ◆ Clear processes for evaluating progress

Finding:

The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates clarity of purpose.

The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate clarity of purpose.

Rationale and Comments:

The purpose and goal of the proposed QI project are both clear and consistent with its intended impact. Milestones and metrics are clearly articulated, and will enable Creighton to monitor its progress in completing the initiative.

3. Evidence of Commitment to and Capacity for Accomplishing the Initiative

- ◆ Commitment of senior leadership
- ◆ Commitment and involvement of key people and groups
- ◆ Sufficiency of the human, financial, technological, and other resources
- ◆ Defined plan for integrating the initiative into the ongoing work of the institution and sustaining its results
- ◆ Clear understanding of and capacity to address potential obstacles

Finding:

The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates evidence of commitment and capacity.

The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate evidence of commitment and capacity.

Rationale and Comments:

The proposed QI project stems from a directive made by Creighton's president, and thus the QI project has support at the highest administrative level. The QI proposal describes how many members of the campus community (e.g., the Provost, department and program chairs, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Excellence and Assessment) will be involved, and that a new subcommittee (of the University Assessment Committee) will be tasked to perform much of the work for the QI project. The proposal also describes how this output of this QI project will be integrated within existing financial and technical resources within the Creighton university structure.

4. Appropriateness of the Timeline for the Initiative

- ◆ Consistency with intended purposes and goals
- ◆ Alignment with the implementation of other institutional priorities
- ◆ Reasonable implementation plan for the time period

Finding

The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates an appropriate timeline.

The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate an appropriate timeline.

Rationale and Comments:

Although the proposed timeline is feasible, it is also aggressive, and the institution may be underestimating the amount and/or complexity of the work necessary to bring the QI project to a successful conclusion. For example, Creighton may discover that arriving at a set of educational effectiveness indicators and corresponding metrics may take longer than the period they envision. The proposed timeline does not explicitly allow for such contingencies.

5. General Observations and Recommended Modifications: (Panel members may provide considerations and suggested modifications that the institution should note related to its proposed Quality Initiative.)

There is concern that the scope of the project is too large for a QI project, and that perhaps Creighton should consider reducing the number of sub-initiatives planned under this QI project to fewer than three. Alternatively, the institution may consider staging one or more of the three sub-initiatives to run in series, rather than trying to complete all three components in parallel. It would be appropriate to first establish agreed-upon processes (with corresponding data requirements) for annual reviews of academic effectiveness at the program level and periodic program reviews prior to discussing new academic programs (and eventually) institutional effectiveness. In addition, it would be helpful if the institution would be more explicit about the steps beyond completing the program evaluations that are anticipated. What processes will be used to effect changes indicated by the assessments.

6. Conclusion:

Approve the proposed Quality Initiative with or without recommended minor modifications. No further review required.

Request resubmission of the proposed Quality Initiative

Rationale and Expectations if Requesting Resubmission

Timeline and Process for Resubmission (the Commission staff will add this section if the recommendation is for resubmission)

