

Academic Audit Onsite Evaluation Checklist

Institution: Pellissippi State Community College

Program: University Parallel

CIP Code: 16.24.010100; 16.24.0101.01; 30.50.0903.00; 08.13.0101.00

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 15, 2015**.

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 24 elements on the evaluation results checklist by marking "met" or "not met". This exercise must be completed and signed by the team prior to the Exit Session [see complete directions on the form]. The original will be left with the department prior to departure but a copy must be forwarded to TBR with the Visiting Team Report.

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 onsite 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, 2015**.


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 Debra McCarter, Vice President, Walters State

Audit Chair's signature:  Date April 17, 2014 ^{5PM}

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

Christine Conn, Director, Education Programs, Chattanooga State 

Jim Kelly, Associate Professor, History, Northeast 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 15, 2015**.

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

5

- Commendation #1 - We commend the excellent self-study report.
Commendation #2 - We commend the culture of collaboration that supports student engagement and assists faculty to grow their strengths.
Commendation #3 - We commend the emphasis on active learning that is tied to learning outcomes.
Commendation #4 - We commend the level of engagement shown by both faculty and students. We commend faculty development opportunities particularly the new Faculty Academy and the inclusion of Adjuncts.

Total Number of Affirmations

1

- Affirmation #1 - We affirm the four recommendations identified in the matrix of initiatives and encourage the institution to implement them according to the proposed schedule.
Affirmation #2 -
Affirmation #3 -
Affirmation #4 -

Total Number of Recommendations

1

- Recommendation #1 - We encourage the institution to expand opportunities to give feedback about their learning experience.
Recommendation #2 -
Recommendation #3 - for student
Recommendation #4 -

Academic Audit Summary Sheet: Undergraduate Program

Institution:

Pellissippi State Community College

Program Title(s):

University Parallel

CIP Code(s):

16.24.0101.00 16.24.0101.01 30.50.903.00, 08.13.0101.00

Academic Audit Status: First Academic Audit Second Academic Audit

Instructions for Academic Audit Team:

In accordance with the 2010-15 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. If the program under review contains embedded Technical Certificates, the names of each certificate should be included on the "Program Title" line above. The review of embedded certificates must be included as part of the review of the program in which they are embedded. Embedded certificates do not require a separate Summary Sheet.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "*Academic Audit Summary Sheet*." The Summary Sheet lists 26 criteria grouped into eight categories. THEC will use the criteria in categories 1-6 to assess Performance Funding Standard 1C when the Academic Audit process is used for programs undergoing the Academic Audit process for the first time. For programs undergoing the Academic Audit for the second time, criteria 7 (follow-up) will also be used to assess Standard 1C. 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 criteria 8.1 - 8.3, they should be marked N/A. These criteria will not be included in the THEC Performance Funding point calculation.

These criteria 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 criterion 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 criterion 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 criterion in the table.

The 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 will be used in allocating state funds for the community college or university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Academic Audit Team Leader (s):

Debra McCarter
Name

Name

Vice President
Title

Title

Walters State Community College
Institution

Institution

Debra McCarter 4/17/15
Signature Date

Signature Date

Academic Audit Summary Sheet				
Institution: <u>Mississippi State</u>			Evaluation Results	
Program Title: <u>University Parallel</u>				
Degree Level: _____				
CIP Code: _____				
Academic Audit Status: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> First Academic Audit <input type="checkbox"/> Second Academic Audit				
1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES			Met	Not Met
1.1	The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for developing learning objectives for the program, considering measurability, clarity and what students need to know.	✓		
1.2	The faculty documented or proposed a process for developing learning objectives that are based on realistic and appropriate evidence.	✓		
1.3	The faculty 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 a thorough and candid analysis of the extent to which they collaborate effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.	✓		
2.2	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for analyzing the content and sequencing of courses in terms of achieving program learning objectives.	✓		
2.3	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for the ongoing review 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 completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for guiding and improving teaching and learning throughout the program. The faculty documented or proposed a plan that promotes the effective use of	✓		
3.2	instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.	✓		
3.3	The faculty 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 documented or proposed indicators of student learning success that are keyed to the learning objectives of the program.	✓		
4.2	The faculty documented or proposed assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices and appropriate comparisons.	✓		
4.3	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for using student learning assessments that leads to continuous improvements in the program.	✓		
4.4	The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.	✓		

5. QUALITY ASSURANCE		Met	Not Met
5.1	There is an evident commitment to making continuous quality improvements in the program a top priority.	✓	
5.2	The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.	✓	
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) included descriptions of the program's quality processes including all five focal areas.	✓	
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 openness and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.	✓	
6.5	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from stakeholder groups identified by the program's faculty.	✓	
7. FOLLOW-UP OF PREVIOUS AUDIT *		Met	Not Met
7.1	An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.	N/A	
7.2	There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Audit Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.	N/A	
7.3	There is documented evidence that the program has implemented and tracked the progress of and use of results from improvement initiatives cited by the faculty its self-study.	N/A	
8. SUPPORT (Note: The Support category is NOT included in the Performance Funding calculation. If the Academic Audit process did not address these criteria, they should be marked "NA.")		Met	Not Met
8.1	The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.	N/A	
8.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.	N/A	
8.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.	N/A	

* Criterion only included in the performance funding calculation for programs undergoing the Academic Audit during the 2010-2015 cycle that also used the Academic Audit in the 2005-10 cycle. Note: please be sure that the "Second Academic Audit" is checked on page 1.

