

**Academic Audit Team Report
General Education Requirements
Cleveland State Community College
March 27, 2008**

I. Introduction

On March 27, 2008, an Academic Audit Site Visit of the General Education requirements for the General Transfer program was conducted at Cleveland State Community College. The audit team consisted of Dr. James Crawford, Dean and Professor of Humanities at Walters State Community College, Ms. Berta Ward, Associate Professor of Psychology at Pellissippi State Community College and Ms. Joni Lenig, Assistant VP for Faculty & Programs and Associate Professor of Computer Information Systems at Columbia State Community College. Before the site visit the team thoroughly reviewed the self-study submitted by Cleveland State. The self-study focused on the courses approved to meet the TBR General Education Requirements from the Humanities division, Social Sciences, Mathematics and Natural Sciences departments. Additionally the team reviewed a massive appendix which included student demographic data, sample surveys and pre/post tests, and the syllabi of each of the General Education courses. Prior to the visit, the team communicated via email, by a phone conference and in a meeting at the hotel on the evening before the site visit. On the day of the visit, the team met with many of the faculty and administrators responsible for these programs. The day began with a brief opening session with the Auditors, the college's President and the Academic Audit Leadership Team. Next the audit team conducted three small group meetings to interview full-time faculty from each of the General Studies divisions/departments. The attendance at these small groups were as follows: nine faculty from the Humanities division and Communications department, eight faculty from the Social Sciences and History departments and eleven faculty from the Math and Science departments. The team also conducted small group meetings to interview five part-time faculty and ten students from a variety of disciplines. The final event was an exit session where the commendations, affirmations and recommendations were presented. This report represents a consensus finding by this team. During the working lunch the audit team agreed upon the items to be covered in the exit session. Sections of this report were written by individual team members and shared via email with all team members with an opportunity for all to provide recommendations for the final report.

II. Overall Performance

The audit team applauds the faculty and staff for the honesty and thoroughness of the self-study of this program. From the interviews, the audit team was assured that the Academic Audit process was faculty driven. The self-study, although organized by academic divisions/departments, did include descriptions of all five domains of the quality processes for each division/department. The process

resulted in a description of weaknesses and suggestions for improvements in each discipline; however, many of these weaknesses were discipline and not program specific. The primary weakness that the audit team identified was the lack of key quality indicators for the General Transfer program as a whole and a systematic process for using multiple instruments to measure the effectiveness of the whole program. The audit team also felt that a lack of communication with part-time faculty and the inconsistent use of standard quality measures in all class sections are issues that likely need to be addressed in more disciplines than those identified in the matrix of improvement initiatives.

III. Performance in the Focal Areas

A. Learning Objectives

Learning objectives have been established for all Cleveland State courses that meet general education requirements. The objectives, listed on course syllabi, are written in the form of student learning outcomes and clearly identify what students should know and be able to do as a result of completing each course. Student learning outcome statements reflect and support the Tennessee Board of Regents' (TBR) learning outcomes identified for each general education category. Faculty in all disciplines generally reported extensive collaboration in course development and revision. Evidence of collaboration within and among departments was found in the college's self-study document and was confirmed through interviews with faculty. Cleveland State's receiving institutions include TBR four-year colleges and universities, University of Tennessee institutions (Knoxville and Chattanooga) and several private colleges and universities including Tusculum, Tennessee Wesleyan, Southern Adventist and Lee. Like other Tennessee community colleges, Cleveland State does not consistently receive formal feedback on the performance of its graduates and transferring students after transfer. However, faculty members from various departments indicated that there is regular communication with faculty and staff from receiving institutions and they make use of the informal feedback from receiving institutions as well as from Cleveland State graduates in reviewing learning outcomes for general education courses.

B. Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

Cleveland State's general education curriculum includes required and elective courses necessary to fulfill core requirements for the degrees offered. There is sufficient variety in the categories that include elective options to allow students to meet the prerequisite requirements for majors at baccalaureate-granting institutions. While a large amount of guidance is provided by the TBR, additional input for curriculum design comes from discussions with receiving institutions, faculty teaching in technical areas, assessment results, national standards where applicable (i.e., mathematics and science) and college-wide priorities.

Writing is a notable college-wide priority. Evidence of the college's commitment to improve students' writing skills was provided by (1) interdepartmental collaboration in the development of writing assignments described in the self-study and during interviews with faculty, (2) course requirements listed on master syllabi and (3) enthusiastic feedback regarding the commitment of faculty across the institution provided by students enrolled in a variety of the college's courses and programs.

Additional evidence of the influence of college-wide priorities on curriculum design includes participation in out-of-class activities required or suggested in a number of general education courses and the extensive incorporation of active learning strategies in course syllabi. The college's Quality Enhancement Plan focus on student engagement appears to have had a notable impact on curricular and co-curricular design. As discussed below, the college recognizes the importance of co-curricular activities and provides a fairly extensive array of out-of-class opportunities that complement students' classroom learning experiences.

C. Teaching and Learning Methods

Faculty have analyzed the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program. However, while many examples of collaboration at the departmental or divisional level can be found in the report, not much is stated about teaching and learning processes on a program level. The auditors' assumption is that the "program" being reviewed at this time is the general education program as a whole rather than its individual components.

The report documents "a plan that ensures the use of instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives." However, most of the examples come from individual faculty or individual departments, while more evidence of program-wide assessment of mastery would be desirable. The report provided considerable evidence that "there is focus on the actual process of teaching and learning" at the department level. Evidence can be seen in the report and was heard during the interview process of attempts by faculty to incorporate a variety of teaching methods in order to address the varied learning styles of students. Also noteworthy is the documentation of student engagement activities for each course within the Math Department. Faculty in the Natural Sciences have embedded an online learning style exercise in their classes designed to heighten student awareness of their individual learning styles. This awareness then leads to online workshops promoting good study habits.

Interviews with both faculty and students provide additional evidence of careful consideration by faculty of teaching methods used to achieve course learning objectives. Most faculty consider varied learning styles in

designing assignments and assessments. Group projects are frequently a component of course delivery as are online discussion boards. Attendance at cultural events is a component of many humanities courses (especially in music and art). As noted above, writing, especially writing based on research, is a significant component of many classes across the campus. Such assignments are designed in a manner to minimize the likelihood of plagiarism. Test bank software that frequently accompanies textbooks permits item analysis, which provides another means of identifying topics or concepts that might need reinforcement. Another form of technology incorporated into some classes is the use of “student response systems” or “clickers,” which allow immediate feedback as concepts are introduced during class. The college’s QEP has also prompted documentation of student engagement activities, which include both in-class and out-of-class activities.

The report cites a variety of strategies for identifying best practices in teaching. Best practices are shared informally as well as through more formal opportunities such as the Brown Bag Lunch Series, sponsored by the Humanities and Social Sciences Division, and college-wide in-service programs. Faculty awareness of new techniques or innovative trends is cultivated by attendance at professional conferences as well as online research. Also mentioned is The Key, where faculty members can present what they have learned at professional meetings they have attended. A math instructor serves as a Calculus AP Reader, involving exposure to faculty from other colleges and universities, which has been helpful in discussions about curriculum. Another source of new ideas cited is textbook reviews and meetings with publishers’ representatives. Mentoring is mentioned as a means for communicating best practices to new faculty and to adjunct faculty. The PAGES initiative involves collaboration between the library, faculty and the adult services staff to stimulate more interest in reading among students. Those students who participate in the reading groups are allowed to keep those books completed.

Other best practices cited from the humanities include the literary magazine, the annual poetry reading, the student newspaper, local art exhibits, and the PAGES initiative, which promotes reading. Other best practices described in the report include the Southeast Tennessee Digital Archive, an online historical archive, and the three-day symposium “Remembering World War II in the 21st Century.”

Students who were interviewed were pleased with the appropriateness and effectiveness of the teaching methods used by their faculty. When asked about the sequencing of courses, they affirmed that pre-requisite courses did, in fact, prepare them adequately for the following courses (e.g., Composition I and Composition II).

Ample evidence is provided in the report of “the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in the design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program.” Periodic faculty meetings are cited as one form of collaboration. Other key influences on curriculum design have been the General Education redesign from several years ago (“Defining the Future”) and, more recently, the NCAT (National Center for Academic Transformation) redesign process, both of which prompted system-wide dialogue on curriculum design. Additional evidence of commitment to consultation with outside sources is cited in several places. For example, the English Department conducted a survey of sister institutions to determine how they might improve their composition courses. Similarly, they have conducted a campus-wide survey of faculty to guide the Language Arts Learning Center in providing needed services. Collaboration among humanities faculty has led to the design of a humanities survey. Examples of interdepartmental collaboration include art faculty consulting English faculty in the design of writing assignments and psychology faculty consultation with nursing and education faculty to ensure that presentation of human growth and development concepts are meeting their needs. Similar collaboration to ensure that other disciplines’ needs are being met is reported by the math faculty.

A recurrent theme, and one that is of critical importance, in the report is the acknowledgment that better training (e.g., orientations) is needed for adjunct faculty. With the reliance on adjunct faculty in English (5 full-time faculty and 19 adjunct faculty), this becomes especially important. Interviews with selected adjunct faculty themselves reinforced that perception. While the adjunct faculty were generally complimentary of the institution, they also felt that being included in department or discipline-specific meetings would be helpful in generating consistency with classes being taught by full-time faculty. Those interviewed also would welcome classroom visits or observations of their teaching. They reported that currently they were not invited to department meetings; however, they also noted how pleased they were to be included in the monthly “Brown Bag Lunches.” Another helpful suggestion to improve their teaching effectiveness was to provide the results of the official student evaluations more promptly. Several noted that these are frequently returned too late for adjunct faculty to be able to incorporate suggestions in the next class.

While student evaluations of faculty are cited as an example of how the teaching and learning process is monitored, no specific parameters were identified regarding what numerical rating (for example, an average of 3.0 on a five-point scale) would be considered acceptable. Similarly, there is no evidence of a formal plan of action if a faculty member’s ratings reveal a subpar performance. Peer evaluations (e.g., within the Math Department) are another means of providing assessment and sharing of ideas.

D. Student Learning Assessment

Ample evidence can be found in the report of plans “for using student learning assessments that lead to continuous improvements in the program,” at least in particular courses and departments. Still, more evidence of comprehensive program evaluation would be helpful. As mentioned earlier, data generated from the administration of a standardized measure of achievement (e.g., the California Critical Thinking, C-BASE, MAPP) would be helpful in guiding curriculum changes and methodology. Part of the need for a more comprehensive approach to assessment will be addressed by the TBR General Education Assessment process, which is being implemented for writing, speaking, math, and critical thinking skills during the fall of 2008 but will be expanded to include all General Education courses in a few years.

However, based upon the written report as well as interviews with selected faculty members, relatively few seemed aware of general education exit exams (e.g., MAPP, C-BASE, etc.), yet such exams, which are helpful in measuring writing, reading, math, and critical thinking skills, are one way in which institutions can derive helpful feedback about the extent to which general education objectives are being met, especially if this information is shared regularly with the faculty. Such standardized measures of achievement also lend themselves to benchmarking, which enables institutions not only to measure their own progress from year to year but also to compare themselves with similar colleges across the state and across the nation.

Most often cited in the report is the use of the master syllabus to assure consistency in course content and assessment. A required component of these syllabi is a list of student learning outcomes, with the assessment methods by which their attainment will be measured. While the development of master syllabi for courses is one way to cultivate consistency in the coverage of course content and evaluation, multiple measures are needed. Aside from general education program assessments, many examples of student learning assessment are described, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences Division. While it is noted that “some” instructors in English administer pre/post tests on grammar and essay writing and in the literature courses, they should be encouraged to adopt this practice throughout the department for “program” effectiveness. Similarly, when questioned about rubrics (for evaluating essays and speeches) or department-wide grading criteria, representatives from English and Speech explained that there had been discussion but no consensus on how to proceed.

The auditors were impressed by the extent to which departments across the campus acknowledged the importance of writing and required writing assignments. However, regular collaboration with the English Department would ensure compatibility with best practices in evaluation and would ensure that documentation of sources conforms to current Modern Language Association (MLA) or American Psychological Association (APA) standards. A positive step in this direction was the survey of faculty by the Language Arts Learning Center regarding writing needs in their particular disciplines.

One of the best examples of individual program assessment is described by the mathematics faculty. They describe collecting data from a common final exam in College Algebra, where each test item addresses a specific program learning objective. The data is compiled and analyzed in a report. No comments addressing how the data will actually be used are included. It may be that this is a new process, and a complete cycle has yet to be completed. Still, it is commendable that the department plans to meet as a group each semester to discuss and analyze this data. Evidence of commitment to ensuring multiple section verification of attainment of learning outcomes can also be found in the Natural Sciences segment of the narrative.

The report cites many additional examples of “assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices.” Many faculty administer pre and post tests in specific courses, but the Humanities faculty have developed a survey that measures achievement throughout that program. The pre test is administered at the beginning of the Composition I courses with the post test coming at the end of the required literature course, which encompasses at least three semesters for most students. Learning Outcome Reports are described in the Math section of the report as “an example of a departmental process of collaboration to develop and assess program learning objectives.” However, it appears that these reports address individual courses rather than the “program.” An example is the report summarizing student success item by item on the final exam in College Algebra. Similar data is also collected and analyzed in the Natural Sciences Division, which has led to modifications in course delivery that enhanced student performance. However, it is not made clear how the data is analyzed. Nevertheless, the underlying intent, which is to ensure consistency of assessment across multiple sections of a course, is commendable.

Evidence was provided that confirmed collaboration in the development and implementation of assessments of program learning objectives; however, in many cases this collaboration was informal and might be improved by the establishment of committees whose work might be documented in summaries or meeting minutes. Perhaps one of the most

encouraging examples of collaboration in the design of curriculum is how the psychology faculty met with both the nursing program and the education program to elicit suggestions for tweaking the curriculum to serve everyone's needs. Similar collaboration is described by the mathematics faculty to ensure that their calculus courses are meeting the needs in physics courses.

While there is some evidence that sources beyond their own faculty were consulted in the design of assessments of program learning objectives, it too seemed to be informal and anecdotal in nature, consisting sometimes of conversations with former students who had transferred to other colleges and universities and were satisfied with their preparation. Periodic (possibly annual) reports focused on how Cleveland State students are performing relative to native students from those institutions to which students usually transfer would be helpful. Of course, the availability of such data is contingent upon the cooperation of the senior universities. Also mentioned are professional conferences attended regularly, at which curriculum matters are discussed. Additional sources of information about curriculum design come from discussions leading to articulation agreements.

E. Quality Assurance

The self-study document provides evidence of faculty "commitment to making continuous quality improvements." Again the team was concerned that these improvements were being made by individual faculty or within departments but did not find evidence that there is a systematic and regular process of ensuring quality throughout the program. Evidence of methods used to measure quality include the Humanities survey. This particular survey is a Humanities-wide initiative in which baseline foundational knowledge is measured in Composition I and a follow-up survey is administered in Composition II. The Math department completes Learning Outcomes Reports as an example of a departmental process of collaboration to develop and assess program learning objectives. The Social Sciences Department reported that all faculty commit to the Quality Enhancement Plan which addresses the relationship between student involvement and student learning. They did report that the adjunct faculty teaching in the Psychology department are held less accountable in applying the standards set forth in the Quality Enhancement Plan. Similarly, from the interviews with the part-time faculty, the audit team did not find consistent job expectations as they might relate to quality assurance. Some of the part-time faculty reported that they were given departmental exams to administer while others reported that they made up their own exam and was not given a departmental rubric for grading of papers or speeches. There seemed to be very limited communications between some of the departments and their

part-time faculty. Another instrument that might be used to measure the overall quality of the program would be the comparison of scores on the General Education Assessment Instrument that is a required component of Performance Funding such as College BASE or California Critical Thinking Skills Test; however, the full-time faculty interviewed did not seem to know which test is administered or if the results are used. Although the team found many examples of using assessment to ensure quality of the various discipline areas, the team was not convinced that a systematic process is in place to ensure that quality is measured in all disciplines or for all sections of a particular course.

IV. Conclusions

A. Commendations

Commendation #1 – The committee commends the Humanities and Social Science division for the Brown Bag lunch series for communication of best practices and recommends that this series be expanded to additional divisions/departments.

Commendation #2 – The committee commends the General Education faculty's commitment to development of student's writing skills in the General Education Core.

Commendation #3 – The committee commends the faculty for their accessibility to students and commitment to student success.

Commendation #4 – The committee commends the institution for its PAGES initiative.

B. Affirmations

Affirmation #1 – The committee affirms the plan to review the Developmental Reading and Developmental Writing prerequisites in Biology and recommends that a similar review be completed in additional disciplines as appropriate.

Affirmation #2 – The committee affirms the Humanities division and History department's plan to develop formal avenues of collaboration with part-time faculty and encourages such interaction with all disciplines.

C. Recommendations

Recommendation #1 – The committee recommends that overall key quality indicators be identified for the General Transfer program and that multiple measures be used to assess this program's effectiveness. These

measures might include departmental pre/post test to evaluate the level and consistency of student learning, results from General Education Exit Exams and other departmental data as appropriate.

Academic Audit Onsite Evaluation Checklist

Institution: Cleveland State Community College

Program: General Education

CIP Code: _____

Degree Level: Certificate Associate Baccalaureate Master's Doctoral

Instructions for Audit Chairs and Teams

Part I: Academic Audit Visiting Team Report – Record of Commendations, Affirmations, and Recommendations

This form must be completed by each audit review team prior to concluding the visit. The original will be forwarded to TBR but a copy must be left with the department prior to departure. All observations included on this form should be represented as commendations, affirmations, or recommendations. Please be concise in your descriptions as you will have opportunity to expand upon your justification for each item in your written report due to TBR by May 15th.

Part II: Academic Audit Summary Sheet (only for use if program is being reviewed for Performance Funding purposes)

This form is only to be completed if the program review is serving as the performance funding review. Using the Academic Audit Summary Sheet complete the 25 elements on the evaluation results checklist (marking "met" or "not met"). This exercise must be completed and signed by the team prior to the Exit Session. The original will be forwarded to TBR but a copy must be left with the department prior to departure.

Part III: Narrative Evaluation and Written Report

The Audit Chair and Team will use their evaluations indicated on the Audit Visiting Team Report and Academic Audit Summary Sheet (if used for Performance Funding purposes) as the basis of a written report. Summarized findings from the self-study report and on-site visit will represent a narrative report of the team's conclusions and the final responsibility of the visiting team. The template for completing this report (limited to 10 pages) is attached. This report is due to TBR on May 15.

The Audit Evaluation will become part of the record of the academic program review and will be shared with the academic department/unit, the college, and the central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Each department/campus will be provided opportunity to respond and comment on the written report.

Audit Chair's name, title, and institution: _____

Audit Chair's signature: [Signature] Date 3/27/08

Names, titles, institutions, and signatures of other Audit Team members:

James Crawford, Dean of Humanities, Walters State Community College
Anta Ward, Professor, Mississippi State

Academic Audit Visiting Team Report

Record of Commendations, Affirmations, and Recommendations

This form must be completed by each audit review team prior to concluding the visit. All observations included on this form should be represented as commendations, affirmations, or recommendations. Please be concise in your descriptions as you will have opportunity to expand upon your justification for each item in your written report due to TBR by May 15th.

This document should serve as the outline of information to be disclosed during the exit session with the department. The original signed copy is to be forwarded to TBR with one copy left with the campus audit contact or department chairperson prior to leaving campus.

Total Number of Commendations

4

- Commendation #1 - The committee commends the Humanities and Social Science division for the Brown Bag lunch series for communication of best practices and recommends that this series be expanded to additional divisions.
- Commendation #2 - The committee commends the Gen. Ed. faculty's commitment to ~~include~~ develop student's writing skills in the Gen Ed Core.
- Commendation #3 - The committee commends the faculty for their accessibility to students and commitment to student success.
- Commendation #4 - The committee commends the institution for its PAGES initiative.

Total Number of Affirmations

2

- The committee affirms
- Affirmation #1 - the plan to review the Developmental Reading + writing prerequisites in Biology and recommend that a similar review be completed in additional disciplines as appropriate.
- Affirmation #2 - the Humanities and History department's plan to develop formal avenues of collaboration with part-time faculty and encourage such interaction with all disciplines.
- Affirmation #4 -

Total Number of Recommendations

1

- Recommendation #1 - The committee recommends that overall key quality indicators be identified for the General Transfer Program and that multiple measures be used to assess this program's effectiveness. These may include departmental pre/post test to evaluate the level and consistency of student learning, results from General Education Exit Exams, and other departmental data as appropriate.
- Recommendation #2 -
- Recommendation #3 -
- Recommendation #4 -

Academic Audit Summary Sheet
Effective Fall Semester 2005 and Required for Performance Funding Exercises

Institution: Cleveland State Community College

Program: General Education
Program Title CIP Code

Instructions for External Reviewers:

In accordance with the 2005-10 Performance Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable undergraduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Academic Audit Summary Sheet." The Summary Sheet lists 25 items grouped into eight categories. THEC will use the items designated with an asterisk (*) to assess Standard IC when the Academic Audit process is used. The criteria in the eighth category, Support, may be used by the institution and submitted as part of the Performance Funding report. If the Academic Audit process did not include information about items 8.1 - 8.3, they should be marked N/A. These items will not be included in the THEC Performance Funding points.

These summary items have been selected based on the Academic Audit Focal Areas to be consistent with the spirit and process of the Academic Audit. The program faculty has provided a self-study document that includes information for each item within the Focal Areas. Supporting documents will be available as specified in the self study. As the Academic Audit Team Leader, you should assess this and other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether the process has met each item within a category. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each item in the table. If a particular item is inappropriate or not applicable to the program, the item should be marked "NA".

This Academic Audit Summary Sheet will be sent to the appropriate campus official for inclusion in the Annual Performance Funding Report. When combined with the self study and the written report prepared by the visiting team, the Summary Sheet will facilitate institutional development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria designated by an asterisk on this form (see categories 1-6) will be used in allocating state funds for the community college or university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Visiting Team Chair:

Name: Joni Lenig

Title: Asst. VP for Faculty + Programs

Institution: Columbia State Community College

Signature and Date: Joni Lenig

Academic Audit Summary Sheet

Summary Items for			Evaluation Results	
1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES			Met	Not Met
*	1.1	The faculty completed an honest analysis of their process for developing learning objectives for the program, considering measurability, clarity, and what students need to know.	✓	
*	1.2	The faculty have documented or proposed a process for developing learning objectives that are based on realistic and appropriate evidence.	✓	
*	1.3	The faculty have documented or proposed specific plans to take best practices and appropriate benchmarks into account in the analysis of learning objectives.	✓	
2. CURRICULUM AND CO-CURRICULUM			Met	Not Met
*	2.1	The faculty completed an honest analysis of the extent to which they collaborate effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.	✓	
*	2.2	The faculty have documented or proposed a plan for analyzing the content and sequencing of courses in terms of achieving program learning objectives.	✓	
*	2.3	The faculty have documented or proposed a plan for determining the soundness of curriculum and co-curriculum based on appropriate evidence, including comparison with best practices where appropriate.	✓	
3. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES			Met	Not Met
*	3.1	The faculty examined the extent to which there is focus on the actual process of teaching and learning throughout the program.	✓	
*	3.2	The faculty have documented or proposed a plan that ensures the use of instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.	✓	
*	3.3	The faculty have analyzed the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in the design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program.	✓	
4. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT			Met	Not Met
*	4.1	The faculty have documented or proposed key quality indicators that are based on the learning objectives of the program.		✓
*	4.2	The faculty have documented or proposed assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices and appropriate comparisons.	✓	
*	4.3	The faculty have documented or proposed a plan for using student learning assessments that lead to continuous improvements in the program.	✓	
*	4.4	The program plan for improvement will use multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.		✓
5. QUALITY ASSURANCE			Met	Not Met
*	5.1	There is a evident commitment to making continuous quality improvements in the program a top priority.	✓	

*	5.2	The faculty have documented or proposed ways to ensure that quality assurance will be a systematic and regular process.	✓	
6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT			Met	Not Met
*	6.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven	✓	
*	6.2	The Academic Audit process (self-study and visit) includes descriptions of the program's quality processes, including all five domains.	✓	
*	6.3	The process resulted in a candid description of weaknesses in program processes and suggestions for improvements.	✓	
*	6.4	Overall, the visiting team affirms the honesty and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.	✓	
7. FOLLOW-UP OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC AUDIT			Yes	No
	7.1	An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.	NA	
	7.2	Recommendations from the previous Academic Audit have been completed.	NA	
8. SUPPORT			Yes	No
	8.1	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.	NA	
	8.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.	NA	
	8.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.	NA	

Revised 9/26/2005; 7/10/2007

*Criterion included in the performance funding calculation.