## Academic Audit Summary Sheet Effective Fall Semester 2005

Institution:	
Program: Program Title	CIP Code
Instructions for External Reviewers:	
In accordance with the 2005-10 Performance Funding guidelines of the Te (THEC), each non-accreditable undergraduate program undergoes either an according to a pre-approved review cycle.	
The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Academic Audi lists 25 items grouped into eight categories. THEC will use the items designate 1C when the Academic Audit process is used. The criteria in the eighth categoriand submitted as part of the Performance Funding report. If the Academic Audit items 8.1 - 8.3, they should be marked N/A. These items will not be included in the	ed with an asterisk (*) to assess Standard y, Support, may be used by the institution process did not include information about
These summary items have been selected based on the Academic Audit Focal process of the Academic Audit. The program faculty has provided a self-stud each item within the Focal Areas. Supporting documents will be available as spe Audit Team Leader, you should assess this and other evidence observed durir process has met each item within a category. A checkmark should be placed if you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each item in the table. If applicable to the program, the item should be marked "NA".	ly document that includes information for ecified in the self study. As the Academic ng the site visit to determine whether the n the appropriate box to indicate whether
This Academic Audit Summary Sheet will be sent to the appropriate cam Performance Funding Report. When combined with the self study and the written Summary Sheet will facilitate institutional development of a program act improvement.	n report prepared by the visiting team, the
Your judgment of the criteria designated by an asterisk on this form (see categ funds for the community college or university's budget.	pories 1-6) will be used in allocating state
Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Visiting Team Chair:	
Name:	
Title:	
Institution:	
Signature and Date:	

nstitution:	:		
Program:			
Ū	Program Title	CIP Code	_

## Academic Audit Summary Sheet

Su	ımmary Ite	ms for		uation sults
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.	CURRICUL	UM 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.	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.	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.		

Institution:			
Program:			
. 5	Program Title	CIP Code	

5.	QUALITY A	SSURANCE	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 faculty accurately identified the program's level of Quality Process Maturity as a result of the Academic Audit process.		
*	6.4	The process resulted in a candid description of weaknesses in program processes and suggestions for improvements.		
*	6.5	Overall, the visiting team <b>affirms</b> the honesty and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.		
7.	FOLLOW-UF	OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC AUDIT	Yes	No
	7.1	An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.		
	7.2	Recommendations from the previous Academic Audit have been completed.		
8.	SUPPORT		Yes	No
	8.1	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.		
	8.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.		
	8.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.		

Revised 9/26/2005
\*Criterion included in the performance funding calculation.