Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1 (Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs): The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: [3.3.1.1] educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.

"The institution provided sufficient evidence that it identifies expected learning outcomes for most academic programs. However, there were numerous insufficiencies in program assessment processes and limited evidence of the use of the analysis of results as the basis for program improvement. (Assessment processes for Art, Sociology, and Political Science are the exception) The institution should provide evidence that it identifies student learning outcomes for each academic program, assesses the extent to which those outcomes are achieved, and uses the results to make improvements based upon analysis of assessment. If sampling is used, describe the method of sample selection and provide representative samples that reflect the full array of educational programs offered, including those offered via distance learning and at off-site locations." (Wheelan, Notification Letter, July 11, 2012).

Narrative:

I. Description of Actions to Address SACSCOC Feedback

Tennessee Tech University addressed this concern by establishing a new Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Review Team, including both faculty members and administrators. This IE Team met regularly to review IE reports in response to SACSCOC feedback above.

A thorough review of previous reports and current practice on program effectiveness was conducted after receiving the SACSCOC feedback above. Many programs at Tennessee Tech are currently collecting assessment data and making improvements on their programs. However, the reports are not consistent across campus concerning reporting format and consistency in expectations and terminology. Improvements were needed in assessment plans and use of results for programmatic changes.

An IE Template and Guide with exemplars was developed to assist academic units in IE reporting and the IE team to review reports. The University Assessment Director and the Interim Associate VP for Academic Affairs collaborated with SACSCOC Evaluators' materials and SACSCOC principles to develop a new template for reporting (Appendix A) and incorporated an

audit form (Palmer, 2011; Appendix B) to evaluate all academic IE Reports consistently. Presentations on SACSCOC Requirements and Standards and the new formatting materials were conducted at our Deans Council and then in individual colleges for department heads. A review timeline was developed (Appendix C), and a spreadsheet (Appendix D) was used to track progress through phases of this comprehensive review.

The IE Team initially identified problems in academic units reporting and assessment plans. The units were then requested to revise the 2011-2012 IE reports using the new formatting materials. They were also asked to revise or develop assessment plans if necessary. Individual consultations between department chairpersons and the IE team members were implemented, and the departments were given feedback on formulating measurable student learning outcomes, designing/using assessment tools that have a mix of direct and indirect measures, and using relevant results for modifications.

Revised reports following the new formatting were submitted and reviewed again by the IE Team. Feedback on the progress of institutional effectiveness in units was implemented in the following categories: Exemplar, Acceptable, or Developing (See Section II for descriptions). The new format for reporting and the feedback provided allowed units to recognize improvements that could be made to student learning outcome strategies and assessment plans. Examples of these actions will be highlighted below.

As a continuing effort on effectiveness for academic programs, IE reports will be collected regularly as a newly required part of our annual reporting from academic areas and will be continually monitored by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of University Assessment. A plan is underway to explore various technology tools for submitting reports efficiently and consistently, and a plan to implement this new technology for collecting these reports in the 2013-2014 academic year will be developed.

In addition to the tasks described above, administrator development is also planned for the future. Presentations on Effective Reporting for Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes, Sampling, and Assessment Tool, as well as numerous resources for this important endeavor will be easily accessible.

Most Notable

Through this extensive review process and the development of new reporting tools, all academic programs have now identified measureable student learning outcomes. Many deficiencies were discovered in the use of assessment for program changes. The addition of Section VII “Improvements to Assessment Plan” in the reporting template allowed academic units to strategically improve plans for assessment and use of results for the departments

categorized as “Developing,” in addition to those in the “Acceptable” stage. Off-site and distance learning programs were found to have planning and assessment procedures that are consistent with on-campus programs.

II. Sampling Procedure

TTU has six major colleges; submitted access exists, on the CD and at the website, to fifty separate academic fields. The highlighted sampling method incorporates three categories and is organized by college hierarchy. Three to four samples from each college, including undergraduate, graduate, off-site locations, and distance learning, are included with at least one from each of the categories (if applicable): Exemplary, Acceptable, and Developing.

Exemplary - Departments /units include specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools (both direct and indirect), and processes for discussion of data. The department units use assessment results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and make changes accordingly.

Acceptable - Departments/units have the appropriate components. However, reporting language may be vague or need revision and adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications are recommended.

Developing - Departments/units sometimes have the components above but need to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. This is shown through the addition of Section VII in their IE reports by discussing improvements to assessment plans, modifications to assessment tools, additions of new assessment tools, and/or sampling and frequency of data collection.

Table 1

Sample by College and Category

Review Category	College of Agriculture and Human Sciences	College of Arts and Sciences	College of Business	College of Education	College of Engineering	College of Interdisciplinary Studies	Distance Learning Program (Reported in Colleges)	Program with components at Off-Site Locations (Reported in Colleges)	General Education (Reported Separately)
Exemplary	Nursing (BS)	Sociology (BS)	Business Administration (BS) Accounting (BS) Business Administration (MBA)*	Curriculum & Instruction (BS)**	Mechanical Engineering (BS)	n/a	Business Administration (MBA)*	Curriculum & Instruction (BS)**	n/a
Acceptable	Agriculture (BS)	Geosciences (BS)	n/a	Exercise Science, Physical Education & Wellness (BS & MS*)	Civil and Environmental Engineering (BS)	n/a	Exercise Science, Physical Education & Wellness (MS)*	n/a	General Education
Developing	Human Ecology (BS) Nursing (MSN) *	English (MA)	n/a	Music (BM)	Electrical Engineering (MS)	Interdisciplinary Studies (BS)** Environmental & Sustainable Studies (BS & PhD) Professional Studies (MSP)*	Nursing (MSN)* Professional Studies (MSP)*	Interdisciplinary Studies (BS)**	n/a

(n/a) Not Applicable

* Includes distance education

**Includes components at off-site location

III. Examples Highlighting Actions due to Assessment Results

(Undergraduate, Graduate, Off-Site, and Distance Learning are included. Actual reports are available on the CD and accessible on the TTU SACSCOC website.)

- **College of Agriculture and Human Sciences**

The **Bachelor of Science in Nursing** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and make changes accordingly. For example, Learning Outcome 9 (Professionalism and Professional Values) was targeted for improvement due to Mid-Curricular Health Education Systems, Inc. (HESI) Results. While the RN Exit HESI reflects improvements in Professionalism and Professional Values at the time of graduation, the Mid-Curricular HESI Exam reflects consistent deficits in this learning outcome at the mid-point of students' time in the nursing program. Possibly, maturation from the junior to the senior year impacts this learning outcome. Faculty anecdotally have commented as well as provided observations and examples of difficulty with professional behavior of students and how to evaluate this outcome effectively in both the didactic and clinical setting. Some courses have integrated a professional behavior clause in clinical evaluation with an "all-or-none" component to clinical grading. The effects of social media on students and social networking are thought to contribute to this outcome being a consistent challenge. Varied formative assessments outside of HESI exams need to be examined and considered by the Faculty Organization. A review of literature for comparison to national trends and issues surrounding professionalism and professional values would help inform additional assessments and evaluation of this learning outcome.

The **Bachelor of Science in Agriculture** provides an example of an acceptable process for use of assessment. Initially, reporting language was vague and needed revision, and adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications were recommended. As a result of this process, numerous changes to the assessment of goals were indicated. For learning outcomes, their use of assessment was found to be efficient, and many actions were taken due to assessment results.

For Learning Outcome 1 (Students will be prepared for employment and advance in agricultural careers), changes were made due to results from the senior exit interviews, the IDEA faculty evaluation, and the Alumni Survey. Composite views of the graduating senior exit interviews show definitive patterns in which students request more hands-on experiences, more

opportunities to study and work on the farms, and more opportunities for internships. In addition, results from IDEA reports and the Alumni Survey have spurred the following processes: Increased advisement by faculty for student internships and offering of international agricultural classes in the form of traveling seminars. Student groups have traveled to Prague, Czech Republic and Mexico. These trips have helped determine new concentrations, much in the same way internships do; a new concentration in Agritourism has been developed and a new faculty member hired to develop the program. This opens new doors to economic development in the Upper Cumberland while offering additional avenues of employment to our students. A course in bee keeping has also been developed. Three courses in food safety in Agritourism heralded a new collaboration between Agriculture and Human Ecology. The number of actively sought grants has increased along with increased success in obtaining outside funding—some of which led to the development of the new courses.

For Learning Outcome 2 (Interested students will be ready for entry and advancement in graduate school and professional programs), changes were made due to results from the Agriculture Major Field Exam (ACAT). New processes are being utilized to administer the ACAT, seeking to provide more useful information for the students themselves. This will give students a better understanding of how far they've come with their degrees. Students are continually encouraged to move into graduate and professional programs. Students expressing interest in such programs are advised to take courses designed to prepare them for education beyond the BS. Currently (2012) faculty members are developing a proposal to establish a graduate program in Sustainable Agriculture.

The **Bachelor of Science in Human Ecology** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). This department had the required components but needed to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. The department reported on progress and modifications on existing learning outcomes. For Learning Outcome 1 (Students will demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to enter careers and advanced studies in Human Ecology and related fields, as reflected by scores equal to or higher than 70% on the TTU criterion referenced major field exam (Human Ecology (HEC) Exit Exam)), results showed that this outcome was not met. Faculty discussed these results. One strategy to improve this score has been to offer flexibility so that core classes are required for each of the concentrations. All concentrations must take *four of the core classes*, and options are available for the remaining three.

The HEC Exit Exam has been slightly revised to reflect more strongly the content in the *four required core class*es. However, the HEC Exit Exam itself has flaws. One recommendation of the AAFCS Site Reviewers was to consult with assessment experts in order to re-write the exam.

The AAFCS certification exam will be piloted during the Spring 2013 semester, and results will be used to determine effectiveness of this exam in measuring student learning in Human Ecology content. If the results are as expected, then the certification exam will become the HEC Senior Exit Exam beginning in the Fall 2013 semester.

However, due to this process it became clear to the department head and faculty members that both the program goals and the outcomes needed to be updated. An example of continuing improvement in these components is shown in this section of their report. New program goals and assessments were created concerning program accreditation, enrollment, and adequate faculty members. In addition to revising program goals to more accurately reflect current practice and future activities, it was necessary to revise student learning outcomes. The current Human Ecology Senior Exit exam (for Student Learning Outcome 1) is not adequate to fully assess overall knowledge; therefore use of the standardized AAFCS certification exam will be piloted to determine its feasibility as an assessment tool. There is no other national exam for knowledge content in Human Ecology. In review of the current student learning outcomes, it was determined that new outcomes and assessments related to critical thinking skills and lifelong learning were missing and needed to be included. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the IDEA Teaching Evaluations, and the Site Supervisor Evaluation will be used to monitor progress on critical thinking, communication, and teamwork.

The **Master of Science in Nursing (Distance Learning)** Regents Online Degree Program (RODP) provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. The program is in a phase of updating all of the required components for reporting institutional effectiveness. Though they have specific learning outcomes mandated by their accrediting body - the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC), they are updating the process for assessment and improvement. Based on feedback from the recent self-study and the NLNAC site visit (Spring 2012), the Director and the Executive Committee are addressing NLNAC Standard 6 by developing a more rigorous program evaluation plan, improving data tracking and monitoring that will incorporate a similar tracking and monitoring system on each of the six university campuses that comprise the RODP MSN consortium, as well as developing a more methodical method for analyzing and using the data for program improvement (addresses all Outcomes 1-7 of their current report for TTU Institutional Effectiveness).

The RODP MSN program has undergone a leadership change with the current Director, Dr. Lois Wagner, assuming the Director position in the 2010-2011 academic year. Dr. Wagner has made substantial progress in leading the program; however, her leadership position did not begin in time to make significant progress in addressing program evaluation and outcomes prior to the recent accreditation visit. The NLNAC site visitors noted, “Although program outcome benchmarks were established, data for the past three years (2008, 2009, and 2010) were

reported inconsistently and many times as one group instead of per year and per specialty." Thus, the Board of Commissioners of NLNAC requested a Follow-Up Report to address Standard 6: Evaluation of student learning demonstrates that graduates have achieved identified competencies consistent with the institutional mission and professional standards and the outcomes of the nursing education unit have been achieved.

The RODP MSN has contracted with Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI), to assist with data collection and analysis related to the evaluation of student learning to determine if graduates have achieved identified competencies consistent with the institutional mission and professional standards as well as the outcomes of RODP MSN. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing has partnered with EBI to develop assessment tools that provide comparative data useful in supporting Schools/Colleges of Nursing in assessment and continuous improvement efforts. We look forward to data that is reliable and accessible to monitor progress in this program.

- **College of Arts and Sciences**

The **Bachelor of Science in Sociology** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment. The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly. For example, Learning Outcome 1 (Majors in sociology will demonstrate knowledge of their discipline at a level above or comparable to the national mean), was assessed by an ETS Major Field Exam in Sociology. To address the weakness in theory and mastery of sociological concepts shown in the results of this exam, the department revised the curriculum by moving SOC 4720 Sociological Theories to the 3000 level (SOC 3100), so that students take it earlier and can use theory in more advanced courses. The department tracks the General Theory Assessment Indictor from the ETS major field exam. Scores indicate progress over the past five-year period.

The **Bachelor of Science in Geosciences** provides an example of an acceptable process for use of assessment. Initially reporting language was vague and needed revision, and adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications were recommended. This department showed use of direct and indirect measures. Changes were made according to results of an exit exam used to measure knowledge pertaining to this department. For example, Learning Outcome 2 (Graduates will demonstrate fundamental knowledge pertaining to their discipline), shows lower scores for those that did not complete certain courses in their progression of the curriculum. The department exit exam to assess content knowledge of graduating seniors shows results that have illuminated weaknesses in the curriculum, particularly with map reading, rocks, and minerals. The department created a new required

course (GEOL 2500 Geologic Fundamentals). Students who completed GEOL 2500 score higher on the exit exam than those who did not. The course emphasizes identification of geologic materials and map reading/interpretation, it is designed, in part, to improve exit exam scores.

The **Master of Arts in English** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This department had the required components but needs to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. For example, Learning Outcome 1 (Students will demonstrate a broad and integrated knowledge of literary history, theory, and pedagogy), was found to need improvement in the assessment process to capture a programmatic evaluation of learning. Although faculty in graduate courses assess student progress through a variety of course embedded assessments (including theses, project papers, comprehensive examinations, seminar papers, and annotated bibliographies), the department does not use a standard rubric to assist in the evaluation of these written requirements. The department's Graduate Studies Committee is in the process of developing a rubric to assist in the evaluation of theses, project papers, comprehensive examinations, seminar papers, and annotated bibliographies. Such a rubric will result in greater consistency of assessment, assure high quality, and make clearer to students the expectations for each form of assessment, thus impacting this student outcome.

- **College of Business**

The **Bachelor of Science in Business Administration** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly. For example, Learning Outcome 1 (Business Core Skills and Knowledge – Business students will demonstrate competency in the core business areas), indicated a need to change course content. One of the instruments used to assess this objective was the ETS test for Business majors. The overall performance of College of Business (COB) students exceeded the national benchmarks of ETS for this test, but their performance in certain content areas was relatively poor. To better understand the assessment results, coverage of content areas on the ETS exam in the core classes was reviewed. The content of the business law and operations management classes was changed. College-wide performance in the business law content area improved from the 47th percentile in Spring 2010 to the 57th percentile in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 and to the 58th percentile in Fall 2012. The review also indicated gaps in coverage of international topics, and curriculum changes were proposed to address these gaps. Syllabi, textbooks, coverage, and exams were standardized in business law, marketing, and operations management classes, which have multiple sections taught by different instructors, to facilitate comparison of assessment results and improvements.

The **Bachelor of Science in Accounting** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly. For example, Learning Outcome 5 is a fairly new learning outcome and relates to accounting students' ability to identify the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and their ability to describe the intent and purpose of efforts to implement IFRS. Learning Outcome 5 was measured for the first time in Fall 2011 in ACCT 3170 Intermediate Accounting I, ACCT 3180 Intermediate Accounting II, and ACCT 4410 Advanced Accounting. A series of embedded course assessments was developed to measure accounting students' overall awareness of IFRS.

To increase student awareness of international accounting issues, in Spring 2011, the Department of Accounting delivered its first Accounting International Experience course, Accounting 4900. Twenty students and two faculty members traveled to London, UK, from March 4, 2011, through March 12, 2011. The trip included visits to multiple business and accounting-related destinations, including a lecture at the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales on International Financial Reporting Standards. Data collected indicates that this was a positive learning experience. The course also included class meetings on campus for discussion of various international business and accounting issues.

The **Master in Business Administration (Distance Learning)** also provides an example of an exemplary process in the College of Business for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly. For example, the results of Learning Outcome 1 (Integrative Business Knowledge – Students will demonstrate ability to integrate knowledge of core business discipline), revealed several needs. Whereas our MBA Exam by ETS scores are above average, we continuously seek to improve on this outcome by providing more integrative assignments throughout the program. We are also working to develop our own integrative cases derived from faculty projects and other outreach activities (e.g., Business Media Center projects, College of Business Board of Trustees). These "live" cases should provide better opportunities for students to integrate their knowledge from across the discipline. Because we now have more online students than on-campus students, we are working to develop an assessment to replace the MBA-ETS exam. In October 2012, a "lunch and learn" workshop was conducted to

address the issues of defining and assessing integration in business education. A rubric for assessing integrative knowledge was presented for faculty consideration.

- **College of Education**

The **Bachelor of Science in Curriculum and Instruction (On-Campus & Off-Site/2+2)** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In addition to on-campus programs, this department also includes off-site courses for a 2+2 Program. The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly.

A variety of courses is offered on and off campus through Curriculum and Instruction (C & I). Most importantly, these off-site courses, totaling approximately thirty, are evaluated the same way as on campus programs are evaluated. The instructors are full-time TTU faculty who travel to off-site locations to hold classes. Exit exams/major field tests are available to all students; computer-based exams are available on TTU's campus, and paper-based exams are available in Nashville, Knoxville, or Chattanooga. The students' choice determines the test format. IDEA faculty evaluations are handled the same as with on-campus classes. Specific data on off-site courses can be found disaggregated from the on-campus data documented in the C & I institutional effectiveness report.

For example, Learning Outcome 1 (Candidates in curriculum and instruction will demonstrate content knowledge in their teaching area), are assessed by meeting passing scores on state licensure examinations (Praxis). In addition, Once Ready to Teach (R2T) is fully implemented, the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), a research-based assessment system, and the Educational Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), a nation-wide pre-service performance-based assessment of teaching quality, will also be used to assess candidates' content knowledge.

All twenty concentrations in C & I have been reviewed and updated in the past twelve months in order to more closely align curricula to standards, keep up with current trends in teacher education, and incorporate Common Core into programs especially methods courses. As we continue to look at Praxis II data, it is important to have a breakdown per site and program to track any trends or patterns (See report). It is also important to track the numbers of students not passing these exams so that we can review course curricula. Faculty met to review the test objectives of these exams and match them to courses where these objectives are being introduced and/or taught. After reviewing the Fall 2012 Praxis II exams, it was decided that the

content of ELED 4872 Professional Seminar I and CUED 4800 Student Engagement needed to be realigned with the CIA and the PLT (Sections on the Praxis II Exam). As the edTPA becomes a very important criterion for Residency, it is essential that we review the rubrics and make curriculum decisions. As stated in their report, TTU candidates scored below the targeted outcome in understanding students' language development & associated language demands. As a result, the faculty of all reading courses will incorporate this rubric into their classes. More attention will be given to specific ways that students in learning tasks use academic language.

The **Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science, Physical Education, and Wellness** provides an example of an acceptable process for use of assessment. Initially, reporting language was vague and needed revision; adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications were recommended. For example, Learning Outcome 1 (EXPW majors will demonstrate content knowledge in their chosen concentration), shows a less than 100% pass rates on the required licensure exam (Praxis). A committee of faculty has been formed to investigate strategies to ensure that all students pass their licensure exam, to be implemented in 2013-2014.

In addition, Learning Outcome 2 (EXPW majors will be capable of competing for jobs in their chosen field as well as graduate study opportunities), upon review, showed the need for more efficient data collection tools to analyze progress. The department is formulating an Alumni Survey and an Online Senior Interview Survey to provide results for actions.

The **Master of Arts in Exercise Science, Physical Education, and Wellness (Distance Education)** provides an example of an acceptable process for use of assessment. Initially reporting language was vague and needed revision; adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications were recommended. The assessment processes are the same for this distance learning program as processes for courses taught on campus in the Department of C & I.

For example, Learning Outcome 1 (EXPW Graduate Students will gain graduate core knowledge as well as concentration specific knowledge which will be beneficial as their careers begin or continue and fulfill the requirements for degree completion) and Learning Outcome 2 (the EXPW Graduate Student will gain the specific knowledge and training needed to receive teacher licensure if the student desires) are measured by a Comprehensive Exam in the department and have a 100% pass rate. However, the department would like to have a more consistent analysis of comprehensive answers; therefore the development of a departmental rubric which aligns with the College of Education's grading rubric was found to be necessary.

The **Bachelor in Music** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). This department had the required components but needed to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. The Department of Music has undergone a complete shift with regard to learning outcomes in 2011-2012. The learning outcomes presented were created by the chair and department assessment committee to better reflect the requirements of the national accrediting body (NASM). Prior to 2011-2012, data were collected in a different manner and the data points for the new outcomes as they are now structured are not available.

Numerous changes to the assessment plan of this department resulted from this process. The chair of the department along with the department assessment committee has identified several areas where there can be improvements to the assessment plan for the coming year. The following strategies will be implemented: track several years of data for each outcome to better assess student outcomes; develop rubrics for the learning outcomes that are currently difficult to measure such as juries, barrier exams and recitals; develop tracking tools for student files that allow for easy data gathering and create other data points that can be used to support outcomes; and develop rubrics for measures that involve projects or performances.

- **College of Engineering**

The **Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering** provides an example of an exemplary process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). The department has very specific measureable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, processes for discussion of data, and uses results to continually monitor progress on outcomes and makes changes accordingly. For example, Learning Outcome 7 (the ability to communicate effectively), was found to need improvement. Assessment data from the Alumni Surveys and the Employer Surveys identified both written and oral communications of students as areas for possible improvement. The External Evaluation of Senior Design Projects also indicated a need for improvement in the final oral presentations of their group projects. Likewise, feedback from the ME External Advisory Board indicated a need for improvement in both written and oral communications. Senior Exit Interview Written Surveys also indicate results slightly below the current target benchmark.

In response to the need for improvement in the final oral presentations in the ME 4444 Senior Design Project course as described above, a second oral presentation was added to the course. This second presentation was in the form of an oral presentation of each group's Project Design Proposal near the beginning of each semester. These presentations are videotaped, with the videotapes then being provided to each student group for self-critique and improvement prior to their final oral presentations.

The **Bachelor of Science in Civil and Environmental Engineering** provides an example of an acceptable process for use of assessment and is also accredited by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). Initially reporting language was vague and needed revision, and adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and modifications were recommended. For example, Learning Outcome 8 (an ability to use techniques, skills, and modern tools for engineering practice), was found to need adjustments to the method of delivery.

Survey results show that the students were not fully satisfied with use of CAD and engineering software in the curriculum. In response to this concern, the CEE Department has taken steps to increase exposure to AutoCAD in ENGR 1110 (Engineering Graphics) and, to the extent possible, in some CEE design courses. The faculty have continually introduced AutoCAD in selected CEE course homework since the last ABET visit. Currently, the courses that require homework assignments to be undertaken with AutoCAD are CEE 3110, 3610, 4320, 4350, 4640, and 4950. In 2012, CEE 3000 Civil Engineering Graphics was approved for use in the CEE curriculum in an attempt to focus student learning on engineering graphics software specifically for CEE applications. This course is currently being implemented into the curriculum.

The **Master of Science in Electrical Engineering** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This department had the required components but needed to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. For Learning Outcome 2 (Apply advanced methods in the development of solutions in the chosen area of emphasis in electrical and computer engineering), students are satisfactorily completing these requirements. There is sufficient documentation and approvals to insure these requirements are being met. These requirements are regularly reviewed and revised by the faculty. No action is identified at this time.

However, upon review of this program, the Graduate Program Committee feedback shows that program goals and learning outcomes need to be improved. In addition, there needs to be documentation as to how course content relates. The following actions were taken: review and revise program goals and learning outcomes; develop a standard format for course syllabi, and relate course content to program goals and learning outcomes. We look forward to seeing the effect of these changes in future reporting.

- **College of Interdisciplinary Studies**

The **Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies (On-Campus, Off-Site, & Distance Learning)** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This department had the required components but needed to add or improve the quality of the assessments and

modifications. For example, Learning Outcomes 1-3 (Demonstrate the skills and knowledge necessary to engage in critical thinking and leadership development, Develop a program of study that integrates learning from two academic emphasis areas, and Demonstrate that integration through a senior-level capstone project that identifies and researches a topic from various perspectives, address significant problems that impact a global society, and communicate findings effectively), are effective and measured. However, improvements to sampling and program evaluation were needed.

The academic advisors of the Interdisciplinary Studies College held several meetings to discuss program quality improvement. Rubrics were reviewed and discussed in alignment between the University mission, ISEE's mission, and graduate/undergraduate program goals and outcomes. They have selected and revised a rubric that will be incorporated into the undergraduate and graduate capstone courses. Data collection will begin in the Spring 2013. Each senior capstone project will be evaluated using a rubric that assesses the thesis problem/question, information gathering, analysis, synthesis, documentation, product/process, and critical thinking.

In addition, important changes have been made to assess distance learning students. As some students in the LIST degree are at a distance from the TTU campus, not all majors have the opportunity to complete the senior exit exam. Improvements going forward will include an online test requirement for all graduating seniors in this degree. An online version of the California Critical Think Skills Test (CCTST) will be implemented Fall 2013 and is a major improvement as the virtual online degree program students and the off-campus cohort students will now have access to the test online.

The **Bachelor of Science in Environmental and Sustainable Studies** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This is a new program offered at TTU, established in Summer 2012. This department has developed the required components but has just implemented this plan for the 2012-2013 academic year, and therefore has not collected data. They have developed an extensive process for reviewing goals, outcomes, assessment results, and actions needed for improvement (See Figure 2. SOES undergraduate program assessment and quality improvement process, in the SOES IE report.) We predict the future reporting for this department will contain these elements.

The **Master of Professional Studies (Distance Learning)** RODP Program provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This department had the required components but needed to add or improve the quality of the assessments and modifications. This is a relatively new program offered at TTU. This department has developed the required components but has just implemented this plan for the 2012-2013 academic year, and therefore has not collected data. The capstone experience includes a professional project which will measure learning

Outcomes 1-5 (See report for this department), and is assessed on the basis of a rubric. Institutional and state-wide comparative assessments are to be developed as the next step of program and assessment formalization, taking into consideration RODP MPS programs.

Program changes at this point are more operational than content. The unit has begun assessing its infrastructure, program delivery, student support, program assessment, and setting benchmarks with institutional and program peers. The degree has had a rapid start and formalization of assessment and reporting beyond the Capstone project and newly developed rubric are a part of current continuing improvement efforts.

The **Doctorate of Philosophy in Environmental and Sustainable Studies** provides an example of a developing process for use of assessment. This department had the required components but also opted to add or improve the quality and use of these items. Learning Outcome 1 (EVS Ph.D. students will demonstrate knowledge of the interdisciplinary nature of environmental science such that they are aware of a wide range of environmental concerns beyond the boundaries of a specific discipline), is assessed by a comprehensive exam (usually in the third year of program). The program's single learning outcome above did not have an adequate assessment tool. A member of the EVS Executive Committee suggested that a common rubric be developed for use by advisory committees during student comprehensive exams, as they are essay in format. The Director drafted such a rubric, and it will be proposed for adoption at the next Executive Committee meeting.

In addition, the Director also recognized there was no formal approach in place during 2011-2012 to assess the program's effectiveness by evaluating assessment results and incorporating changes. Therefore, the Director developed a planning cycle to be presented to the Executive Committee at its next meeting (See table and flowchart in Appendix E of the SOES PhD Report). The cycle will be implemented in mid-2013 after incorporating comments and receiving approval from the Executive Committee. The cycle provides target dates regarding when assessments will be made, when results will be summarized and discussed by appropriate parties, and when necessary changes will be approved and implemented.

- **Distance Learning Programs**

Distance learning programs were found to have consistent planning and assessment process with their on-campus counterparts. Measurable student learning outcomes are established, and assessment processes are in place that allow for these programs to continuously monitor and improve their strategies for student learning. The following programs are reported above, under the College in which they were established.

- **Business Administration (MBA) -** *Exemplary*
- **Exercise Science, Physical Education & Wellness (MS) -** *Acceptable*
- **Nursing (MSN) -** *Developing*
- **Professional Studies (MSP) -** *Developing*

- **Programs with Components at Off-Site Locations**

Programs with components at off-site locations were also found to have consistent planning and assessment process with their on-campus counterparts. Measurable student learning outcomes are established, and assessment processes are in place that allow for these programs to continuously monitor and improve their strategies for student learning. Students have the same access to resources as those on campus, and have the choice in the method of delivery of instruction, as well as the assessment of instruction and performance. A great example of this can be found in the College of Eduction section of this report. The following programs are reported above, under the College in which they were established.

- **Curriculum & Instruction 2 + 2 (BS) -** *Exemplary*
- **Interdisciplinary Studies (BS) -** *Developing*

- **General Education**

The learning outcomes reported (See General Education Report) have been established for the six areas of the general education program at all TBR institutions and apply to the general education program at TTU. Since Fall 2009, TTU has participated in the TBR-wide assessment of core competencies within the general education program: written and oral communication, mathematics, and critical thinking. Each of these areas is assessed using direct methods based on work embedded within a particular course or performance on a nationally-normed testing tool. The assessment of other areas of general education (humanities/fine arts, natural science, history, social/behavioral sciences) will be the next phase of implementing the general education assessment plan coordinated at the state level by the Tennessee Board of Regents. These methods will be primarily indirect, but will include direct measures in some areas where available, such as the Force Concept Inventory used for introductory courses in physics.

Tennessee Tech is engaged in a variety of efforts intended directly to improve learning in general education courses. These efforts include two NSF-funded grant projects for improved teaching methods in introductory-level physics courses and in the precalculus course that many students must take prior to enrolling in the calculus courses required in their majors. Tutoring and support in writing, mathematics, chemistry, and other areas has also been enhanced by the establishment of a “learning commons” in the renovated first floor of the university library, as

well as through tenured faculty members released from 50 percent of their teaching loads to serve as heads of the new learning villages that are being established at the rate of 1-2 per year; each village also has a substantial budget for "academic peer mentors," experienced students who are available to tutor first-year students living in the same village. Two awards for excellence in general education teaching are given each year, highlighting and publicizing successful instructional methods. The Center Stage program, initiated specifically as a general education activity for students, offers frequent opportunities for students to see presentations on issues of social diversity as well as musical, theatrical, and literary and visual arts programs.

The primary challenge facing the TTU general education program at this point is to construct a more comprehensive assessment plan that includes all areas of general education, not just the core competencies areas where assessment is currently mandated by TBR. The range of courses taught within a single general education area can include faculty from three different colleges and several different departments. Likewise, the various learning outcomes are wide-ranging and listed in no particular order of importance. Effectively coordinating assessment and improvement will require identifying shared priorities that connect various disciplines and instructional cultures.

The expanded general education assessment program will include reflective self-assessment by faculty in all areas, including those currently assessed directly, a two-part approach (faculty in ENGL 1010 and 1020 are already doing this). The reflective assessment instrument, to be completed annually by faculty teaching general education courses, will compare the teaching priorities of instructors in particular courses with the TBR learning outcomes for the relevant area (e.g., humanities/fine arts, etc.). These responses will help determine which outcomes are most important to the various faculty teaching a particular course (e.g., Introduction to Sociology), so that learning outcomes for that course can be prioritized and improved teaching methods can be more readily identified. Even though the general education program and its assessment requirements are regulated statewide by TBR, setting priorities within the prescribed learning outcomes will lead to more strategic institutionally distinctive general education instruction that will serve as an effective foundation of undergraduate education and promote lifelong learning.

IV. Conclusion

Again, most notable through this extensive review process and the development of new reporting tools, all academic programs have now identified measureable student learning outcomes. They either have assessment tools in place, added new assessment tools, or are in the process of developing them. Many deficiencies were discovered in the use of assessment for program changes. The addition of Section VII "Improvements to Assessment Plan" in the

reporting template allowed the units to strategically improve plans for assessment and use of results for modifications. Off-Site and Distance learning programs were found to have planning and assessment procedures that are consistent with on-campus programs as reported above.

SACSCOC feedback led us to recognize a need to improve our process for institutional effectiveness reporting. A new process, templates and reporting deadlines have been established to monitor institutional effectiveness continually and consistently across campus. Annual Reporting requirements include the submission of these reports at the end of each academic year to the Office of Academic Affairs University Assessment. This new process will allow Institutional Effectiveness to be continually monitoring for the improvement of student learning outcomes and assessment plans. In July 2013, the university will begin a review of 2012-2013 reporting and will be monitoring progress on all departments, especially those departments that have made substantial changes to learning outcomes, strategies, and assessment plans.

V. References

1. Institutional Effectiveness Audit form©—2004 Marila Palmer. Modified 2011. All rights reserved.
2. Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement (2011) http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/PrinciplesOfAccreditation.PDF
3. Through the Eyes of an Institutional Effectiveness Evaluator (2012) Dr. Marila Palmer, SACSCOC Summer Institute Presentation, Atlanta GA.

VI. Appendices

A. Institutional Effectiveness Guide and Template for Academic Programs
B. Institutional Effectiveness Audit Form (Palmer, 2011)
C. Timeline for Institutional Effectiveness Report
D. Progress Tracking Spreadsheet

Appendix A
Institutional Effectiveness Guide and Template for Academic Programs

SACSCOC Core Requirements:

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

---

Helpful hints:

- *Build an initial roadmap for the reviewer to follow. Charted overviews, policy outlines, and, summary of goals, outcomes, and assessments.*
- *Organize narrative by key terms in Institutional Effectiveness guidelines. (Ongoing, Integrated, Institution-wide, Researched-Based, Systemic, Accomplishing Mission, Continuing Improvement 2.5 & 3.3.1)*
- *Explain in narrative how outcomes are related to mission and goals.*
- *The IE Reviewers must see Practice, Policy, and Product (examples).*
- *Reviewers look for numbers, percentages, and comparative and longitudinal data. Combine direct and indirect measures. Use multiple assessments in each area. (Researched based. 2.5)*
- *Documentation must be ongoing and systematic. A minimum of 2 cycles should be included when comparing measures and making changes. (Ongoing. Systematic. 2.5)*
- *It is also important to include proof of analysis and integration of data and changes. Meeting minutes, agendas, email discussions. This shows leaders have shared, discussed, analyzed, and acted upon the results. (Analysis. Integrated. 3.3.1)*
- *Highlight sections pointing to proof. (Evidence of Improvement. 3.3.1)*

Common Mistakes:

- *No overview or clear "roadmap" to guide the evaluator*
- *Multiple formats in the documentation*

- *Confusion with traditional/nontraditional learning and on/off campus learning*
- *Inconsistent names for the same program*
- *Inconsistent terminology throughout document*
- *Poorly align assessments with outcomes and goals*
- *Using only indirect measures for assessment*
- *Mismatch between unit documentation and information in catalog or website*
- *Not enough focus on "Modifications and Continuous Improvement or Program Changes/Actions due to Assessment"*
- *Mistaking completed strategies for assessment. (If you just have to report a check off list of actions, then you are not using assessment correctly. Find a direct measure related to learning outcomes)*
- *Try to cover academic jargon or instruct on what IE is and is not*
- *Are not specific enough or too specific*
- *Write too much to cover the lack of substance*
- *Confuse personnel evaluation with department evaluation*
- *Attribute lack of consistency to prior format, method, or person*
- *List portfolios, papers, or presentations as an assessment but have not developed a rubric for program evaluation*
- *Fail to close the loop: modification come from nowhere and are not tied to assessment results; No assessment results are cited (No results = no use = no improvement = no compliance); Nothing done about assessment results cited*
- *List only a summary of improvements: must include the "why"*

Institutional Effectiveness Template

Comments in italics are not part of the template, but are meant to guide you through the process.

Academic Year:
Program/Department:
College:
Submission Date:
Contact *(Person submitting this report)***:**

I. Program/Department Mission:

Organize narrative by key terms in Institutional Effectiveness guidelines. (Ongoing, Integrated, Institution-wide, Researched-Based, Systemic, Accomplishing Mission, Continuing Improvement

2.5 & 3.3.1) Explain succinctly in narrative how outcomes are related to dept/unit/institutional mission and goals.

II. Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes *(Both Undergraduate and Graduate Programs)***:**

Program goals must ultimately impact Student Learning Outcomes. Student Learning Outcomes are required for reporting on this standard. Student learning outcomes specify the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in courses or in a program. The expectation is that the institution will engage in on-going planning and assessment to ensure that for each academic program, the institution develops and assesses student learning outcomes. Outcomes do not change much from year to year, but strategies to accomplish outcomes might and probably should change. Clearly define outcomes in measureable terms found in respective assessments.

Methods for assessing the extent to which students achieve these outcomes are appropriate to the nature of the discipline and consistent over time to enable the institution to evaluate cohorts of students who complete courses or a program. Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution's success at achieving its mission and can be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions. At appropriate intervals, program and learning outcomes and assessment methods are evaluated and revised.

III. Assessments *(Related to goal/outcome above)***:**

- **Name of the Assessment Tool** (List the assessment time frame) –List the Outcomes #'s.

Use an assortment of well-matched assessment types related to respective goals/outcomes with a mix of direct and indirect measures. Describe the process of periodic review of assessments used.

For academic units, major filed tests, certification exams, exit interviews, exit exams, engagement surveys, employer surveys, rubrics for portfolio's or capstone projects, internship supervisor surveys, etc. Use a mix of direct and indirect measures.

Direct Versus Indirect Measures: Assessment efforts are categorized as direct and indirect.

***Direct measures** are based on a sample of actual student work, including reports, exams, demonstrations, performances, and completed works. The strength of direct measurement is that faculty members or programs are capturing a sample of what students can do, which can be very strong evidence of student learning. A possible weakness of direct measurements is that not everything can be demonstrated in a direct way, such as values, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes.*

***Indirect measures** are based upon a report of perceived student learning. The strength of indirect measures is that they can come from many perspectives. However, in the absence of direct evidence, assumptions must be made about how well perceptions match the reality of actual achievement. A possible weakness of indirect measures is that they are not as strong as direct measures because we have to make assumptions about what exactly the self-report means.*

IV. Rationale for Outcomes and Assessments (Process of Data Analysis):

It is the program's/department's responsibility to make a compelling case as to why the sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's programs. Describe what assessment instruments were used and why they were selected. Evaluators are looking for use of multiple assessment methods. How was the data disseminated and analyzed throughout the department to make modifications?

V. Results *(Use current results compared to past results if applicable)*:

Highlight the name of the **Assessment Tool** (List Outcome #s) and present results…

This contains a highlighted section that includes evidence <u>for</u> improvement. Insert graph, tables, and charts that provide mature data for your decisions of outcomes and for improvement. You report the data results here. You will discuss the results in the next section.

For academic units, major filed tests, certification exams, exit interviews, faculty selection of objectives and student progress on objectives (IDEA- Individual Development and Educational Assessment), exit exams(CCTST- California Critical Thinking Skills Test), engagement surveys(NSSE- National Survey of Student Engagement), employer surveys(TTU Employer Survey or Departmental Employer Survey),alumni surveys (TTU Alumni Survey Project or Departmental Alumni Survey), rubrics for portfolios or capstone projects, internship supervisor surveys, etc. Use a mix of direct and indirect measures.

Benchmarking Tips: The goal of benchmarking is to provide a standard for measuring, and to help identify where opportunities for improvement may reside. Setting benchmark goals with assessment data should be done so carefully. If you say that you will increase performance by specific percentage points within a time frame, chances are that you will experience a "ceiling effect" in the data over time. A better way to make benchmark comparisons with your data would be to compare to a rolling three year average, or compare to the national mean results of the assessment tool of applicable. Most standardized data sets have results disaggregated by discipline for comparisons, and they definitely have a national mean. This should be taken into consideration when setting your assessment goals in relation to your student learning outcomes.

VI. Modifications and Continuing Improvement: Program Changes due to Assessments (for Learning Outcomes)

For Outcomes #, #, & #- *Describe changes made.*

Link to Assessment Data: *Describe the link between modifications to strategies and the assessment results you reported.*

Discuss evidence <u>of</u> improvement, based on analysis of assessment results, as opposed to a plan for improvement for each outcome mentioned above. Note: It's okay to say that no modifications are needed at this time, but prove you looked at the data to determine this. Describe actual changes and why they were made, based on the described assessment above. You can mention upcoming plans for changes, but you should have already discussed actions that have already been implemented as a result of your data reported in the above section. Highlight the use of assessment results to improve education

programs, thus impacting student learning outcomes. And, highlight the use of assessment results to improve student learning outcomes. ***The Modification and Continuing Improvement section should be the main focus of your report. It should be extensive and concise. This section is the main reason for reporting institutional effectiveness, and should stand out in the report.***

VII. Improvements to Assessment Plan

Discuss any changes made to the department's assessment plan. Include any new tools or modifications to existing tools here.

Contact Academic Affairs for help:

Dr. Theresa Ennis	931-372-6124	tennis@tntech.edu
Dr. Sharon Huo	931-372-3225	xhuo@tntech.edu

Resources:

1. *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* (2011) http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/PrinciplesOfAccreditation.PDF
2. "Through the Eyes of an Institutional Effectiveness Evaluator" (2012) Dr. Marila Palmer, SACSCOC Summer Institute Presentation, Atlanta, GA.

Appendix B - Institutional Effectiveness Audit Form

_____ COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	OUT-COMES/ GOALS	ASSESS -MENTS	CITES RESULTS	USE OF RESULTS/ EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT	ANALYSIS	CYCLE or YEAR 1	CYCLE or YEAR 2	CYCLE or YEAR 3	NOTES & NAMES/TYPES OF ASSESSMENT
INSTITUTIONAL MISSION:									
3.3.1.1 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS									
General Education									
GEN ED TOTALS									
Undergraduate Programs									
•									
•									
•									
UNDERGRADUATE TOTALS									
Graduate Programs									
•									
•									
GRADUATE TOTALS									
Nontraditional Programs									
•									
NONTRADITIONAL TOTALS									
Professional Programs									
•									
PROF PROGRAM TOTALS									
3.3.1.2 & 3.3.1.3 ACADEMIC & STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES									
•									
•									
SUPPORT UNIT TOTALS									
3.3.1.4 RESEARCH									
•									
TOTALS									
3.3.1.5 COMMUNITY/PUBLIC SERVICE									
•									
TOTALS									
GRAND TOTAL									

NOTE: This spreadsheet includes enough room for only a few administrative & academic units. Rows may be expanded to include all units.

Appendix C

Timeline for Institutional Effectiveness Report

Date	Activity
October 17 – 31, 2012	Presentations on the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Report Guide and Template at Deans' Council, Colleges…
Friday, December 7, 2012	**Academic Program IE Report due to Academic Affairs**
December 7, 2012 – February 1, 2013	Review of Programs IE Reports
Friday, February 1, 2013	Review comments back to academic units
Friday, March 1, 2013	**Revised Academic Program IE Report due to Academic Affairs**
Tuesday, March 19, 2013	Draft Response Report for CS3.3.1.1 ready for review – Part of the Referral Report
March 19, 2012 - March 28, 2013	Review of the Draft Referral Report
Wednesday, April 3, 2013	Finalization of the Referral Report
Monday, April 15, 2013	Referral Report due to SACSCOC

Appendix D - Progress Tracking Spreadsheet

	Department	Revision I (Due Dec 7)	Feed Back (By Feb 1)	Revision II (Due March 1)	Final PDF	Point of Contact	Reviewer
College of Agriculture and Human Sciences							
1	Agriculture BS	Extension, Received	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Billie Foster	Dr. Ennis
2	Human Ecology BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Melinda Anderson	Dr. Natarajan
3	Nursing BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Bedalia Russell	Dr. Natarajan
4	Nursing RODP MSN	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Sherry Gaines	Dr. Ennis
College of Arts and Sciences							
5	Biology BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Brad Cook	Dr. Northrup
6	Biology WFS BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Brad Cook	Dr. Northrup
7	Biology MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Brad Cook	Dr. Northrup
8	Chemistry BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Jeff Boles	Dr. Ennis
9	Chemistry MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Jeff Boles	Dr. Ennis
10	Communication/ Speech BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Brenda Wilson	Dr. Anderson
11	English BA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Linda Null	Dr. Ennis
12	English MA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Linda Null	Dr. Ennis
13	Foreign Languages BA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Marketta Laurila	Dr. Anderson
14	Geosciences BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Mike Harrison	Dr. Ennis
15	History BA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Jeff Roberts	Dr. Ennis
16	Mathematics BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Allan Mills	Dr. Natarajan
17	Mathematics MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Allan Mills	Dr. Natarajan
18	Physics BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Steve Robinson	Dr. Natarajan
19	Political Science BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	James Raymondo	Dr. Anderson
20	Sociology BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	James Raymondo	Dr. Anderson
College of Business							
21	Accounting BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Richard Rand	Dr. Ennis
22	Business Admin BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Ramachandran Natarajan	Dr. Ennis
23	Business Admin MBA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Tom Timmerman	Dr. Ennis
College of Education							
24	Art BA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Ward Doubet	Dr. Northrup
25	Counseling and Psychology BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Barry Stein	Dr. Anderson
26	Counseling and Psychology MS	Received	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Barry Stein	Dr. Anderson
27	Curriculum and Instruction BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Susan Gore	Dr. Northrup
28	Curriculum and Instruction MS	Not Complete, Updated, Received	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Susan Gore	Dr. Huo
29	Curriculum and Instruction PhD	Not Complete, Updated, Received	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Lisa Zagumny	Dr. Huo
30	Exercise Science, Physical Educaiton and Wellness BS	Not Complete, Updated, Received	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Steve Smith	Dr. Ennis
31	Exercise Science, Physical Educaiton and Wellness MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Steve Smith	Dr. Northrup
32	Music BA	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Jennifer Shank	Dr. Northrup
College of Engineering							
33	Chemical Engineering BS	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Pedro Arce	Dr. Huo
34	Chemical Engineering MS	Extension, Received	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Pedro Arce/Robby Sanders	Dr. Huo
35	Computer Science BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Doug Talbert	Dr. Natarajan
36	Computer Science MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Doug Talbert	Dr. Natarajan
37	Civil and Environmental Engineering BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Ben Mohr	Dr. Huo
38	Civil and Environmental Engineering MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Ben Mohr	Dr. Huo
39	Electrical Engineering BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Charles Carnal	Dr. Huo
40	Electrical Engineering MS	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Charles Carnal	Dr. Huo
41	Engineering PhD	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Roy Loutzenhiezer	Dr. Ennis
42	Manufacturing and Industrial Tehcnology BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Ahmed Alsawy	Dr. Natarajan
43	Mechanical Engineering BS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Darrel Hoy	Dr. Huo
44	Mechanical Engineering MS	Recieved	Completed	Revised	Exemplary	Darrel Hoy	Dr. Huo
College of Interdisciplinary Studies							
45	Environmental & Sustainability Studies BS	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Dennis George	Dr. Ennis
46	Environmental Sciences PhD	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Dennis George	Dr. Ennis
47	Interdisciplinary Studies BS	Extension, Received	Completed	Revised	Developing	Steve Frye/Tammy Boles	Dr. Ennis
48	Professional Studies BS	Extension, Received	Completed	Revised	Developing	Bonita Barger/ David Hume	Dr. Ennis
49	Professional Studies RODP MPS	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Developing	Brad Gray	Dr. Ennis
General Education							
50	General Education	Extension, Recieved	Completed	Revised	Acceptable	Kurt Eisen	Dr. Ennis