



Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
Program Title CIP Code

## Academic Audit Summary Sheet

Summary Items for			Evaluation Results	
<b>1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES</b>			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.		
<b>2. CURRICULUM AND CO-CURRICULUM</b>			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.		
<b>3. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES</b>			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.		
<b>4. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT</b>			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: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Title

CIP Code

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 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-UP 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.