

## **Section 4.2: Undergraduate Program**

### **Committee Members**

Nancy Allen, Chair  
Department of English

Phillip Holcomb, Co-chair  
Department of English

John Wegner, Editor  
Department of English

David Alexander  
Department of Management

Mark Allan  
Library

Paula Baxter  
Financial Aid

Melanie Croy  
Department of Kinesiology

Michael Griffin  
Department of Biology

Nancy Hadley  
Department of Education

Crosby Jones  
Department of Biology

William Montgomery  
Department of Psychology

Lorri Morris  
Admissions

Maria de los Santos Onofre-Madrid  
Department of Spanish

Martha Sleutel  
Department of Nursing

John Vinklarek  
Department of Art

John Wheeler  
Department of History

## **Introduction**

This chapter evaluates Angelo State University's (ASU) undergraduate program, including admission policies, completion requirements, curriculum, instruction, and academic advising. Also provided are two appendices evaluating policies for and practices of the international education program and Goodfellow Air Force Base education program. The Committee's conclusions are based on a thorough review and evaluation of published policies, survey results, and official data.

Please note that unlike most of the other sections of this report, the Committee's recommendations and suggestions are placed at the end of each subsection because of the substantial length of this section. The discussion of overall strengths and weaknesses is presented at the end as "Findings." For Appendix A and Appendix B, strengths, weaknesses, recommendations, and suggestions are presented at the end of each appendix as "Findings."

## **Overview**

Undergraduate education is Angelo State University's greatest strength. From its establishment in 1928 to the present day, the University has been dedicated to its undergraduate program. ASU's faculty, departments, administration, and governing boards have had a clearly expressed commitment to providing the highest quality of undergraduate education possible.

As a component institution of The Texas State University System (TSUS), ASU receives most of the directives that govern its policies from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) or from the Board of Regents; The TSUS, and ASU does an outstanding job in translating these directives into daily practice. Admission policies are clearly stated, consistently administered, and widely published. Undergraduate core curriculum (general education) courses are mandated by the State while other lower-level and upper-level completion requirements are determined by a routine and regular process involving faculty at every step. The University has also begun an orderly process to develop technology-based instruction.

Undergraduate advising is generally satisfactory across the campus, and solutions have been proposed to even out the number of students assigned to individual advisors, especially in those departments with large numbers of majors. Nevertheless, all students have access to advising by faculty members as well as access to the computerized On-Course Automated Degree Plan Program that the University has recently implemented.

Faculty members conduct undergraduate instruction at the highest level of professionalism. The University hires competent faculty and closely monitors them during their probationary period. Non-tenure track faculty are also closely supervised in their departments. For tenure and promotion decisions, tenure-track faculty are evaluated in light of their teaching, scholarship, and service. The

strength and dedication of the faculty and the supportive climate provided by the administration and governing board create a solid foundation for undergraduate education at Angelo State University.

#### **4.2.1 Undergraduate Admission**

**General admission policies must be established by the governing board on recommendation of the administration. The board is responsible for deciding the size and character of the student body. Implementation of specific admission policies, however, is the responsibility of the administration and faculty of the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

As stipulated in the *Rules and Regulations of the Texas State University System Board of Regents*, “Student admissions standards, entrance requirements, and degree qualifications shall be determined and prescribed by each [university] subject to the approval of the Board” (VI-1). Each academic year, the University submits a copy of the *Summary of Institutional Data Planning Resource Guide* to the Board for its review and approval. These data describe ASU in terms of student body demographics, which include—but are not limited to—enrollment by gender, ethnic classification, and academic discipline. The data also include figures on enrollment, admissions and retention, Carr academic scholarships, student financial aid, and occupancy of residence halls. This information assists the Board of Regents in determining policies related to the size and character of the student body.

Once the Board has approved admission policies, the administration and faculty of the University are responsible for implementing them as published in the *2001-2003 Bulletin (Faculty-Staff Handbook, I-2, II-1)*, online at [http://www.angelo.edu/publications/faculty\\_handbook/fshb.pdf](http://www.angelo.edu/publications/faculty_handbook/fshb.pdf). Department heads, academic deans, Admissions Committee, Office of Admissions and Retention, Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), President, and Board of Regents all participate in determining these policies.

**The unit responsible for administering the policies must be clearly identified.**

The University is in compliance.

The unit responsible for administering admission policies is the Office of Admissions and Retention under the direction of the Director of Admissions, who reports to the VPAA, who, in turn, is accountable to the President (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, “Angelo State University Administrative Organization,” p. [ix]).

**In those institutions in which various subdivisions maintain separate admission requirements, there must be institution-wide coordination of all admissions policies and procedures.**

The University is in compliance.

Admission requirements at ASU apply to all students. Only the School of Education and the Department of Nursing mandate separate requirements for admission to their programs. Admission to the Teacher Education Program requires a cumulative 2.5 GPA on all work attempted and a grade of C or better in designated course work to demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing, mathematics, communication, and critical thinking (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 348). Specific requirements for admission to the associate and baccalaureate degree programs in Nursing are identified on pp. 322-323 and pp. 332-333 in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*.

**Admission policies must be consistent with the educational purposes of the institution.**

**They must include qualitative and quantitative requirements that identify students who demonstrate reasonable potential for success at the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

Admission policies are consistent with the educational purposes of the institution and apply to every division of the University. ASU selects students who can pursue their goals in accordance with the University's mission statement and the application of admission criteria: "Angelo State University commits itself to the equal consideration of all qualified applicants for admission without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, or national origin, and without regard to disabilities as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990" (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 46).

ASU has established requirements in order to admit students who demonstrate reasonable potential for success. Full or part-time students may be admitted under one of six categories identified in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (p. 47-52). A beginning freshman, the status of the average student upon admission, must have a high school diploma or GED and is eligible for regular or provisional admission by meeting one of the requirements identified below.

The University requires that students from an accredited high school (1) be in the top half of their graduating class at the time of application or upon graduation; (2) satisfactorily complete the Texas Scholars Program, the Texas Advanced High School Program, or the Distinguished Achievement Program; (3) have a minimum score on the ACT or SAT I test as stated in the University's admission policies; or (4) have a 50% or greater probability of earning an overall C average during the freshman year at ASU based on high school grades and ACT or SAT I scores.

A beginning student from an accredited high school who has not met one of the admission requirements stated above may qualify for provisional admission through the Academic Year Provisional Admission program. To be eligible, an applicant must complete a college preparatory curriculum while in high school and have a 50% or greater probability of earning a 1.35 GPA during

the freshman year. Any applicant who has not completed a college preparatory curriculum must have a 50% or greater probability of earning a 1.60 GPA during the freshman year.

Students who have earned a GED may qualify for regular admission by presenting a composite score of 23 or above on the ACT or a combined score of 1030 on the SAT I. Students whose scores fall below the minimum requirements may qualify for provisional admission by completing six hours of prescribed course work during a summer session with a grade of C or better in each course.

In the *2001-2003 Bulletin*, the University also clearly identifies admission requirements for transfer and international students as well as for early admission for students participating in the dual-credit program (pp. 48-49, 51-52). The President is responsible for “all other provisions and conditions of admission” not covered under the categories identified above (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 52).

**An institution admitting students with deficiencies in their preparation for collegiate study must offer appropriate developmental or remedial support to assist these students. Diagnostic testing should be an important element of a developmental or remedial program.**

The University is in compliance.

The *ASU Developmental Education Plan* (Spring 2000), copies of which are provided to each academic department and administrative unit, details policies regarding the University’s developmental programs. These policies are also described in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp. 130-132, 250, 316). The discussion of the developmental programs in English and mathematics that follows is taken from this *Plan*.

The University uses two distinct criteria to place students in developmental education. One reflects State requirements based on the student’s performance on the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) Test. The passing standards in reading, writing, and mathematics have been set by the State and are identified on p. 131 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin*. The other reflects local University requirements based on the student’s performance on specified sections of the ACT or SAT 1 (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 250, 316).

The developmental education programs in English and mathematics include both course and non-course-based components that emphasize a level of proficiency in the verbal and quantitative skills necessary for success in college-level courses and in preparing for the TASP Test. The developmental English curriculum includes one three-semester-credit-hour course, 130C, covering critical reading skills and fundamentals of writing. The developmental mathematics curriculum includes two three-semester-credit-hour courses, 130A and 130B, covering arithmetic, pre-algebra, elementary algebra, and geometry.

The non-course-based component in English is provided through the Language Learning Center, a University academic-support service operated by the English Department. The Center, staffed by specially trained graduate students and peer tutors, provides one-on-one tutorials in reading and writing complemented by computer-assisted instruction. Students participate in individually designed activities that address the objectives of the Texas Academic Skills Program, including critical reading skills, essay structure and development, and basic grammar principles. Additionally, students enrolled in English 130C may visit the Center as frequently as they wish for one-on-one assistance with their assignments.

The non-course-based component in mathematics consists primarily of a computer-based instructional program designed to address the objectives of the Texas Academic Skills Program in the basic areas of mathematics fundamentals, problem solving, applied mathematics, pre-algebra, and geometry. The system also has an instructional management feature that makes it possible to tailor non-course-based learning activities to a student's specific need and to monitor the student's progress from the office PC. TASP preparation workshops, conducted at various times during the semester by the developmental mathematics faculty, constitute another important element in the non-course-based program. The Mathematics Department also operates a Developmental Mathematics Laboratory, staffed by qualified departmental assistants and by faculty who are teaching developmental classes, for students seeking one-on-one assistance with any of their developmental activities.

To verify placement, the developmental mathematics program administers a diagnostic test for English 130C at the beginning of each semester. A student who passes the test is given the opportunity to place out of the course. If that student has not passed both the reading and writing sections of the TASP Test, the student must participate in the non-course-based developmental activities or choose to remain in English 130C. The mathematics developmental program also administers a diagnostic test is also in all Mathematics 130A classes during the first week of the semester. A student who passes the diagnostic test is given the opportunity to place out of Mathematics 130A and enroll immediately in Mathematics 130B or may elect to remain in Mathematics 130A.

**Each institution must regularly evaluate its admission policies. It is the responsibility of the institution to ensure that its recruiting activities and materials accurately and truthfully portray the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

Responsibility for evaluating admission policies is assigned to the University's Admissions Committee, which, although established several years ago, was not reactivated until fall 2000. Before this time, any changes in policies were made by the administration in response to State mandates and with Board approval. The current committee, chaired by the Director of Admissions and Retention and composed of the VPAA and six tenured faculty members, is charged with annually monitoring

the academic performance of entering freshman. Each year, this committee reviews the previous year's experience with freshmen and the enrollment and retention patterns of the University. The committee then makes recommendations to the President for review by the Administrative Council. The Board of Regents approves all changes to admission policies.

Regular program evaluations ensure that activities and materials used in the recruiting process accurately reflect any changes in the University's policies. The ASU staff members who officially represent the University at recruiting functions participate in annual training sessions conducted before each recruiting season to ensure that accurate information is provided in all activities. Additionally, ASU is a member of the Texas Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and the Texas Association of College Admissions Counselors. Staff members periodically attend annual development workshops provided by these organizations, both of which promote professional standards and ethical practices.

The Coordinator of Recruiting annually reviews recruiting materials for accuracy and truthfulness. Copies of these materials are also sent to each department for review before being revised. The Director of Admissions and Retention then reviews the documents and, when appropriate, submits the revisions to the VPAA for approval. In some instances, recruiting materials are submitted to the President for his review and approval.

**To be admitted to degree programs, applicants must show evidence of high school graduation or other successful experiences which reasonably predict their ability to make satisfactory progress at the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

As discussed earlier, all first-time freshmen admitted to the University must show evidence of high school graduation or a GED. Additionally, admission requirements for transfer and international students as well as for high school students participating in ASU's dual-credit program are clearly stated on pp. 46-52 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin*.

**Each institution must assess and justify the appropriateness of experiences offered in lieu of a high school diploma.**

Because the University requires a high school diploma or GED of all applicants, this requirement is not applicable.

**Procedures established for implementation of institutional admission policies must be followed in the admission of all students.**

The University is in compliance.

All applications for admission are subject to the same requirements identified on pp. 46-52 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin* and are processed as follows:

1. On receipt of the application and supporting documentation, staff in the Office of Admissions and Retention enter this information into the student record system and determine if an admission decision can be made at this time.
2. The Office notifies the prospective student that the application has been received and identifies any missing documentation needed to complete the file.
3. Once all required documentation is received, the Office approves or denies admission and notifies the applicant regarding admission status.

Applicants who are denied admission have the right to appeal their admission status. Appeals must be made in writing to the Director of Admissions and Retention and must include a letter from the applicant explaining the reasons for requesting an admission review and two letters of recommendation from prior educators. All appeals are reviewed by a committee composed of the Associate Director of Admissions and Coordinator of Transfer Services and chaired by the Director of Admissions and Retention.

**The institution must provide evidence that it selects students whose interests and capabilities are consistent with the admission policies. An institution's admission and retention policies should not be compromised to maintain a desired enrollment.**

The University is in compliance.

Admission policies clearly identify entrance requirements consistent with the educational purposes of the University as identified in its mission statement. These policies, in accordance with regulations mandated by the Board of Regents, are subject to regular review by faculty and administration and must receive Board approval before implementation.

Data from 1995–2000 for the admission of first-time freshmen support the University's application of qualitative and quantitative requirements in admitting students who demonstrate potential for success. During this period, 73.6% of the applicants qualified for regular or provisional admission under the published requirements (Admissions Report, ADM 012). The average GPA of students admitted during these six years (see Table 4.2.1) exceeded the minimum requirements stipulated in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* on p. 147 for satisfactory academic progress, thus providing evidence of a direct correlation between admission criteria and academic performance (GPA Average Report).

Table 4.2.1

Average Yearly Grade Point Average for First-Time Freshmen, 1995-2000

Academic Year	First-Time Freshmen Regular Admission	First-Time Freshmen Provisional Admission
1995	2.64	1.93
1996	2.58	1.94
1997	2.64	2.00
1998	2.65	2.07
1999	2.60	2.06
2000	2.58	1.86

As a matter of policy, the University does not compromise admission or retention policies to maintain a desired enrollment. Rather, ASU is committed to enrolling and retaining the most highly qualified students possible while maintaining a total enrollment “that will sustain a wide variety of programs and reflect the cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity of the region and State” (*Academic Master Plan 2000*, p. 8)

To achieve this goal, the University has implemented several proactive initiatives to evaluate and improve admissions and retention. Among these is a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, under the direction of the Director of Admissions and Retention, that evaluates the effectiveness and importance of programs and services related to admission and retention. Additionally, the University is participating in two studies whose purpose is to accumulate data that will expand the statistical study of various student populations in order to identify successful predictors for retention and academic performance. The first of these is the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange, administered by the University of Oklahoma. This study provides a demographic picture of students who are retained for up to six years and who graduate. The second, administered by the Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning at Indiana University, is the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The results of this study will be combined with the University’s database to predict what type of student behavior leads to higher retention rates and grade point averages.

**An institution must clearly define and publish its policy on the admission of transfer students.**

**The policy must include the following: the requirement for official transcripts of credits earned from all institutions of higher education previously attended; qualitative and quantitative criteria determining the acceptability of transfer work; criteria regarding the award of advanced standing, whether by credit earned at another institution, by advanced placement examinations, or through experiential learning; and conditions governing admission in good standing, admission on probation, and provisional admission.**

The University is in compliance.

The University publishes its policy on the admission of transfer students on pp. 48-49 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin* and in the *Guide for Transfer Students*. A student who has submitted the required admission documents and official transcripts from all institutions attended will be considered for admission as a transfer student if the student has earned eighteen or more transferable semester credit hours (sch) with a minimum 2.00 cumulative grade point average. Any student who has earned less than 18 sch must apply for admission to the University under the high school graduate policy. A transfer applicant who is on academic suspension or dismissal from the last institution attended is ineligible for admission.

A transfer applicant who desires to enroll only during the summer session may be considered for admission without restrictions if the student is not on academic/disciplinary probation or suspension from another institution. Also, credit by examination awarded by another institution will be accepted as transfer credit at ASU if assigned a transferable course number on the transcript.

**Institutions which award credit based on advanced placement or other examinations; training provided by non-collegiate institutions, such as armed forces and service schools; professional certification; or experiential learning must meet the following conditions governing the award of such credit:**

- 1. The amount of credit awarded is clearly stated and is in accord with commonly accepted good practice in higher education.**
- 2. Credit is awarded only in areas offered within the current curriculum of the institution, and is appropriately related to the student's educational programs.**
- 3. Decisions regarding the awarding of credit and the determination of such credit are made by qualified faculty members at the institution, or according to procedures and standards approved by qualified faculty. The institution demonstrates that assessment procedures verify that the credit awarded is appropriate.**

The University is in compliance.

Angelo State University awards credit for satisfactory performance only on standard State and national examinations. Policies for awarding credit by examination and those courses approved by the academic departments for which credit may be received appear on pp. 135-140 in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*. Scores required by the University on these examinations are recommended by the American Council on Education and approved by the deans and department heads. Credit by examination may also be awarded for other ASU courses with the permission of the VPAA.

Credit for nontraditional learning is awarded only to active-duty or discharged military personnel and is available in only two ways. Credit for the language training that military personnel receive from the Defense Language Institute (DLI) is awarded based on the Defense Activities for Non-Traditional

Education Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests (DSST) or based on the American Council on Education (ACE) or DLI transcripts. Credit for basic military training is awarded based on copy of the student's Discharge from Active Duty (DD214 form), Community College of the Air Force transcript, or ACE transcript.

**In awarding credit for prior experiential learning, the institution must (1) award credit only for documented learning which demonstrates achievement of all outcomes for specific courses in an approved degree program; (2) award credit only to matriculated students, identify such credit on the student's transcript as credit for prior experiential learning and, upon request from another institution, document how such learning was evaluated and the basis on which such credit was awarded; (3) ensure that credit for prior experiential learning does not duplicate credit already awarded or remaining courses planned for the student's academic program; (4) adopt, describe in appropriate institutional publications, implement and regularly review policies and procedures for awarding credit for experiential learning; and (5) clearly describe, and establish the validity of, the evaluation process and criteria for awarding credit for prior experiential learning.**

Because the University does not award credit for non-academic experiences or allow the use of experiential training to count toward a degree, these criteria are not applicable.

**The institution must inform transfer students of the amount of credit which will transfer, preferably prior to their enrollment, but at least prior to the end of the first academic term in which they are enrolled.**

The University is in compliance.

The University ensures that transfer students are informed in a timely manner of the results of their transcript evaluation. Once the Office of Admissions and Retention approves a transfer student for admission, the Office of Transfer Student Services begins the process of evaluating the student's college transcripts, usually within two weeks after the date of approval for admission to the University. At peak times, the transcript evaluation process may take longer, but students are always notified of their evaluation results before the end of their first semester of enrollment (*Guide for Transfer Students*). To ensure all files are reviewed, the Office of Transfer Student Services generates weekly reports listing any students who have been granted admission but who have not received a final transfer evaluation.

The transfer office notifies the student that the transcripts have been evaluated and encloses a copy of the credit evaluation. Copies of the evaluation are also forwarded to the appropriate academic dean and the department head of the student's major.

**Course work transferred or accepted for credit toward an undergraduate degree must represent collegiate course work relevant to the degree, with course content and level of instruction resulting in student competencies at least equivalent to those of students enrolled in the institution's own undergraduate degree programs.**

The University is in compliance.

Course work transferred to the University is relevant and comparable to course work offered at ASU. The Office of Transfer Student Services uses recognized guides to determine acceptance of transfer credit. The Texas Common Course Numbering (TCCN) System, which is designed to help students transfer credit for general academic courses from one Texas college or university to another, is used to evaluate general education courses. The courses that are assigned a TCC number are listed on p. 53 in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*. To determine the acceptability of course work earned from regionally accredited United States colleges and universities, the Office uses *Transfer Credit Practices of Designated Educational Institutions*, a guide published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). The *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*, prepared by the American Council on Education, is used to evaluate military credit.

ASU does not evaluate transcripts for transfer students who have attended a foreign college or university. These students may, however, send their transcripts to a foreign credentials service such as the International Education Research Foundation for evaluation. The only exception is students who participate in the University's international education exchange programs from designated universities in France, Germany, Mexico, and Scotland. In this instance, qualified ASU faculty members evaluate transcripts for the sole purpose of awarding academic scholarships.

**There must be clearly defined policies regarding the academic dismissal, suspension and readmission of students.**

**Readmission of students dismissed or suspended for academic reasons must be consistent with the academic policies of the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

Angelo State University clearly defines its policies on the academic dismissal, suspension, and readmission of students on pp. 147-148 in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*.

Any student whose cumulative GPA falls below the required minimum set for the student's academic classification at the end of a semester or at the end of a summer session will be suspended. The required cumulative GPA for each grade level is identified in Column I of the Grade Point Average Requirement Table on p. 147 in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*. Also, a student classified as a junior (or

higher) on academic probation for two consecutive registrations will be suspended if the probationary status is not removed before the third registration as will a student required to enroll in a developmental course who fails to achieve a grade of C or better after the second enrollment in that course.

The length of academic suspension is defined in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (p. 148). The first suspension is for one academic semester and any intervening summer session, the second is for one calendar year, and the third generally results in permanent dismissal. A student on academic suspension is ineligible to register for any course work at ASU.

The policy to readmit students after an academic suspension is consistent with the University's mission to provide an education to students for their personal and career development. A suspended student may apply to be readmitted to the University by submitting a new Application for Admission to the Office of Admissions and Retention. To ensure the period of academic suspension has lapsed, personnel review the student's ASU transcript before determining the student's admissibility. Any student requesting admission who has not completed the suspension period may appeal to the appropriate dean for permission to reenter the University.

#### **Section 4.2.1: Recommendations and Suggestions**

Because the University complies with all the requirements for Undergraduate Admissions, the Self-Study Steering Committee makes no recommendations. The Committee offers, however, the following suggestion:

1. The Admissions Committee should remain active, meeting regularly to review admission policies and to make appropriate recommendations in the best interest of the students and University.

#### **4.2.2 Undergraduate Completion Requirements**

**In each degree program, there must be an appropriate sequence of courses leading to the degree.**

The University is in compliance.

Angelo State University offers forty-one undergraduate programs in twenty-four disciplines leading to eight baccalaureate degrees (Appendix B of Section I lists them). ASU also has one two-year program leading to an associate degree in Applied Science in Nursing. Table 4.2.2.a lists these programs. Descriptive entries in the University's *2001-2003 Bulletin* for each college and the School of Education as well as those for each department indicate the specific requirements and an

appropriate sequence of courses leading to the degrees offered in that curricular area (pp. 149-174, 182-360).

**Table 4.2.2.a**

**Undergraduate Degree Programs Offered by Angelo State University**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Degree</b>	<b>Teacher Certification Program</b>	<b>2001-2003 Bulletin Page Number</b>
Accounting	B.B.A.	No	183
Animal Science	B.S.	No	289
Art	B.A.	Yes	219
Biochemistry	B.S.	No	306
Biology	B.S.	Yes	296
Business International Option Management Information System	B.B.A.	No	198
Chemistry	B.S.	Yes	306
Communication	B.A.	Yes	233
Computer Science	B.B.A.	Yes	206
Drama	B.A.	Yes	238
English	B.A.	Yes	247
Finance Financial Planning Option Real Estate Option	B.B.A.	No	188
French	B.A.	Yes	271; 272
General Studies	B.G.S.	No	159
German	B.A.	Yes	271; 274
Government Criminal Justice Option	B.A., B.S.	Yes	254
History	B.A.	Yes	264
Interdisciplinary Child Development and Learning	B.S.	No	352
Journalism	B.A.	Yes	242
Kinesiology	B.S.	Yes	211
Management	B.B.A.	No	199
Marketing	B.B.A.	No	203
Mathematics	B.A., B.S.	Yes	132
Medical Technology	B.S.	No	304
Music	B.A., B.M.	Yes	225
Nursing	A.A.S., B.S.N.	No	327; 335
Physics	B.S.	Yes	339
Physics, Applied	B.S.	No	341
Psychology	B.A., B.S.	No	279
Sociology	B.A., B.S.	No	284
Spanish	B.A.	Yes	271; 276
Studio Art	B.F.A.	No	221

The appropriate sequence of courses is ensured by the degree requirements described in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*, through advising, and through the activities of curriculum review committees operating at the departmental, college or school, and University levels. Degree and Graduation Requirements in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* detail the core curriculum requirements common to each of the six baccalaureate degrees and the one associate degree (pp. 153-174). This section also describes degree specific requirements; academic majors; supporting concentration (minor); teaching fields for secondary teacher certification; and other requirements, including number of required advanced hours and elective hours, grade and residency requirements, and minimum total semester hours for completion of the degree.

Each degree plan in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* identifies an orderly sequence of courses within the academic major and within the core curriculum of common lower-level course requirements and related fields of study. A system of prerequisites, identified in each department's course descriptions provided in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*, supports the appropriate sequencing of courses. Additionally, advisors monitor each student's orderly progress through the student's designated degree program.

In the case of students seeking elementary, secondary, or all-level teacher certification, the School of Education has established and oversees appropriate sequencing of courses and other requirements through formal procedures for admission to the program, completion of the certification program, approval to take appropriate ExCETs (Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas), and recommendation for certification. These procedures, described on pp. 348-351 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin*, help ensure the orderly sequencing of courses and positively impact the appropriate sequencing of courses in those departments offering teacher certification programs.

Moreover, the University's system of curricular review provides for appropriate sequencing of courses. Each academic department reviews specialized and/or advanced courses within its field to determine their sequence and prerequisites. Any additions or changes are submitted to the appropriate college or school curriculum committee for approval. The University Curriculum Committee then reviews these requests and forwards recommendations to the VPAA, who then makes recommendations to the President. The Board of Regents is responsible for final approval of course additions and changes. In certain circumstances, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) must approve course additions and changes (*Curriculum Change Guidelines*, February 2001). A more detailed discussion of curricular review appears in Section 4.2.3, Undergraduate Curriculum.

**An institution must publish the requirements for each degree it awards.**

The University is in compliance.

Degree and graduation requirements common to each baccalaureate degree and for the associate degree in Nursing are published in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp. 149-174). Specific and additional academic major requirements are published under each department heading in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp. 182-360), online at <http://www.angelo.edu/dept/>, and on some departmental web pages. Degree requirements are also available to each department, as well as advisors and students, through the On-Course Automated Degree Plan System. Approximately 95% of all degree plans are currently auditable on line. Because of the complicated nature of certain degree programs, the remaining 5% will not be included in the program. Further discussion of this online audit system appears in Section 4.2.5, Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students.

**The requirements must be appropriate to the degree offered and must specify the total credits, the number and distribution of general education credits, the number of credits to be earned in the major or area of concentration, the number of electives, standards for satisfactory progress, and other degree requirements.**

The University is in compliance.

The foundation of all degree programs is the State-mandated core curriculum. Also, the University's curriculum review process summarized above and described more specifically in Section 4.2.3, Undergraduate Curriculum, ensures the appropriateness of requirements for each degree. At the departmental, college or school, and University levels, faculty and the administration not only review proposed courses, but also determine how these courses fit into the individual degree program as well as into the larger curriculum. Each department has the primary responsibility of determining the appropriateness of courses leading to the degree(s) it offers.

The specific requirements for each baccalaureate degree and for the associate degree appear under the Degree and Graduation Requirements in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp. 149-174). Additionally, specific requirements for each major or supporting concentration (minor) are identified within the appropriate departmental or school section of the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp.182-360). Each section includes the total number of credit hours required, the number and distribution of general education credits, the number of credits to be earned in the major or supporting concentration (minor), the number or range of elective credit hours, and other specific degree requirements. The publication of these requirements and the process of curriculum review guarantee the appropriateness of both the specific baccalaureate and associate core curriculum requirements and the requirements specific to each degree program.

Some departments also follow standards set by national organizations or State boards in identifying curricula appropriate to the degree. For example, the Department of Mathematics uses guidelines provided by the Mathematics Association of America Committee on Undergraduate Program in Mathematics, the Department of Nursing reviews its requirements in light of mandates issued by the Texas State Board of Nurse Examiners, the Department of Physics relies on guidelines provided by

the American Association of Physics Teachers, and the School of Education follows regulations established by the State Board for Educator Certification.

To ensure that requirements are appropriate to each degree, departments are required to review all their programs at the same time, with undergraduate and graduate programs reviewed independently, effective the 2001-2002 academic year. Each departmental review is to occur on a seven-year cycle and is to include one external reviewer from off-campus (*Academic Master Plan 2000*, p. 13). The first cycle includes the School of Education as well as the Departments of History, Management and Marketing, and Physics.

**Undergraduate degree programs must contain a basic core of general education courses.**

**A minimum of 15 semester hours for associate programs and a minimum of 30 semester hours for baccalaureate programs are required for degree completion.**

The University is in compliance.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board approved a forty-five semester-hour core of general education courses for all baccalaureate degree programs at Angelo State University in May 1999. The University's two-year program, the Associate in Applied Science in Nursing, has a nineteen sch core of general education courses. Table 4.2.2.b identifies the minimum requirements for general education classes that comprise the core for baccalaureate degrees. In some academic programs, courses may be taken that fulfill both core curriculum and academic major or supporting concentration (minor) requirements (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 153-174). Also, various disciplines identified in the core curriculum require more courses beyond the minimum requirements in order to offer appropriate classes to develop specialization in that area. The basic core required of all undergraduate degree programs is identified on pp. 153-174 of the *2001-2003 Bulletin*.

**Table 4.2.2.b: ASU Requirements for Core Courses in Baccalaureate Degrees**

<b>Core Course Requirements</b>	<b>Minimum Required Hours</b>
Communications	3
Computer Literacy	3
English	9
Government	6
History	6
Mathematics	3
Natural Science	8
Physical Activity	1
Social Science	3
Visual and Performing Arts	3

ASU offers only one associate degree, the Associate in Applied Science in Nursing, which has a nineteen sch core of general education courses. Sixty-nine hours are required to complete the degree, with a minimum of thirty sch in residence, of which seventeen sch must be nursing courses (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 173-174).

**The core must include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics.**

The University is in compliance.

Core course requirements include one course in each of the following areas: communication, computer literacy, mathematics, physical activity, social science, and visual and performing arts. Two courses are required in government, history, and natural science, and three courses are required in English (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 153-174).

It is important to note that several of the core curriculum requirements may be fulfilled in different ways. Students interested in these options are directed to the section of the *2001-2003 Bulletin* that discusses credit by examination (pp. 135-140).

**The institution must demonstrate that its graduates of degree programs are competent in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills and the basic use of computers.**

The University is in compliance.

There are two primary ways graduates of ASU demonstrate their competence in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and the basic use of computers. The first is by completing the core curriculum requirements. The second is by completing a baccalaureate degree.

The core curriculum provides each student with minimal competence in each of the listed areas, and students passing these State-mandated courses are deemed competent. The computer literacy component may be fulfilled by completing one of the following courses: Finance 2323, Education 2323, Computer Science 1331, or University Studies 2323. While each of these courses teaches basic computer literacy, each has a special emphasis. Finance 2323 emphasizes business applications, Education 2323 emphasizes education applications, and CS 1331 emphasizes semi-technical applications. USTD 2323 deals with topics such as data processing, text writing, computer-aided instruction, and other applications related to teaching and research in the liberal and fine arts.

Each academic degree program, to varying degrees, provides further experience in reading, writing, oral communication, mathematics, and computer literacy. B.A. students have advanced training in reading, writing, oral communication skills, and use of computers; after completion of core course

requirements, they may not have much mathematical practice, if any. B.S. students receive adequate training in reading, mathematics, and computers; but after completion of core course requirements, they have little formal training in writing or oral communication. B.B.A. students are similarly prepared. In other words, all students receive training in these areas in both core and some advanced coursework as their particular degree programs dictate.

The ASU Teacher Education Council mandates that those students seeking certification must also demonstrate proficiency by earning a grade of C in the following courses: History 1301/1302 or Government 2301/2302; Communication 2301 or 2331; English 1301 and 1302; and Mathematics 1302, or a designated college-level class (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 348).

The 2000-2001 Alumni Survey asked ASU graduates about their perceptions of their preparation in basic skills; response to three specific questions indicate their overall satisfaction. When asked if their education enabled them (a) to communicate effectively and (b) to apply mathematical tools in the solution of real-world problems, the university-wide median response was 4; when asked about their ability to use computer-based technology, the university-wide response was 4. (The scale ranged from 1—not helpful; 3—helpful; 5—very helpful.)

**An institution must clearly define what is meant by a major or an area of concentration and must state the number of credits required for each.**

The University is in compliance.

While specific definitions of “major” and “supporting concentration” (minor) do not appear in the *2001-2003 Bulletin*, the University explains these terms by providing a composite inventory of available academic majors and supporting concentrations (minors) in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* on pp. 178-79 and by listing specific requirements in sections devoted to each University department responsible for the major on pp. 182-360, including the required number of credits for the major and supporting concentration (minor), the number or range of electives, and other course requirements. Through this careful organization of sequenced courses required for an undergraduate degree in a particular program, the University defines a major or supporting concentration (minor) by implication as a grouping of related, appropriately sequenced courses that characterize and distinguish a specific field of study.

**An adequate number of hours with appropriate prerequisites must be required in courses above the elementary level.**

The University is in compliance.

Each academic department determines the adequacy of required courses above the elementary level and of the sequence in which those courses should be taken. All degree programs except the Bachelor

of Science in Nursing and the Associate in Applied Science in Nursing require a minimum of thirty-nine advanced hours. The required minimum of advanced hours in the major discipline varies with the specific degree program, but in no case is fewer than eighteen hours. Descriptions of advanced courses in each degree program identify prerequisites (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, 182-360).

Periodic reviews by curriculum committees and other review processes at the departmental level attest to the adequacy and appropriateness of degree requirements within each program, including the number of advanced hours and prerequisites. A clearly structured process of review, the extent of which is determined by the degree of change proposed, further demonstrates the adequacy and appropriateness of degree requirements.

**For degree completion, at least 25 percent of semester credit hours, or the equivalent quarter hours, must be earned through instruction by the institution awarding the degree.**

The University is in compliance.

In all undergraduate degree programs except the Associate of Applied Science in Nursing, 33 hours in residence are required within a total of 130 hours equaling 25.3%. The Associate of Applied Science in Nursing requires 30 hours in residence within a total of 69 hours equaling 51.5% (Table 4.2.2.c). Residency requirements are stated in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* on pp. 153-174.

**Table 4.2.2.c**

**Degree Requirements—Advanced Hours and Hours in Residence**

<b>Degree</b>	<b>Advanced Hours in Major Discipline</b>	<b>Hours Required in Residence</b>	<b>Percentage of Hours Required in Residence</b>
Bachelor of Arts	18	33	25.3
Bachelor of Fine Arts	24	33	25.3
Bachelor of General Studies	30	33	25.3
Bachelor of Music	24	33	25.3
Bachelor of Business Administration	21	33	25.3
Bachelor of Science	31	33	25.3
Associate of Applied Science in Nursing	0	30	51.5

**All courses, other than those identified by the institution as developmental/remedial, offered by an institution for credit must be acceptable as requirements or electives applicable to at least one of its own degree or certificate programs or must be clearly identified on transcripts as not applicable to any of the institution’s own degree or certificate programs.**

The University is in compliance.

Excluding those in developmental English and mathematics, all courses offered at ASU apply to one or more degree programs as requirements or electives. The *2001-2003 Bulletin* lists both the core requirements for the baccalaureate and associate degree programs as well as specific course requirements for each college, the School of Education, and each department (pp. 153-174, 182-360).

#### **Section 4.2.2: Recommendations and Suggestions**

Having determined that the University complies fully with all the criteria for Undergraduate Completion Requirements, the Self-Study Steering Committee has no recommendations. The Committee offers, however, the following suggestion:

1. To help ensure clarity and to reflect commonly accepted practice, the term “minor” should replace “supporting concentration” in future *Bulletins* and all other applicable University publications.

#### **4.2.3 Undergraduate Curriculum**

**Curricula must be directly related and appropriate to the purpose and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates or degrees awarded; to the ability and preparation of the students admitted; and to the financial and instructional resources of the institution.**

The University is in compliance.

All curricular offerings at Angelo State University are governed by the mission statement and contribute to a “stimulating educational climate which will offer students maximum opportunities for academic achievement and personal growth” (*State Strategic Plan, 2001-2005*, p. 6).

Additionally, the University has a carefully devised process, described in detail below, to ensure the appropriateness of all curricula and to ensure that every course in ASU’s inventory of academic programs is directly related to degrees awarded. In addition to local oversight, curriculum decisions are, in some cases, governed by external agencies such as the THECB, other State boards, and various accrediting bodies. These same processes monitor the curricula to ensure that course offerings are appropriate for students admitted to the University. Even students admitted provisionally have courses available to assist in developing the academic skills and attitudes necessary for success.

As a public institution in Texas, the University obtains its operating monies from a State formula as well as from locally generated funds. These funds and the instructional resources of the institution are adequate to support the University’s curricula. In 1998, the University successfully completed a

General Management Audit by the Texas State Auditor's Office, indicating its success in the fiscal management of and support for its academic programs.

**The institution must have a clearly defined process by which the curriculum is established, reviewed and evaluated.**

**This process must recognize the various roles of the faculty, the administration and the governing board.**

The University is in compliance.

The University has established a rigorous, multi-level process for developing new courses and programs as well as for evaluating and, if necessary, changing existing curricula. Acting on the recommendation in the *Academic Master Plan 2000*, the University has implemented a formal, systematic review by all departments of all their programs. This Academic Program Review Process occurs on a seven-year cycle and requires a least one external reviewer from off-campus (p. 13).

The institution-wide process also enables the University to prevent any changes that might negatively affect other components of the institution or the university system. As noted in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*, "Each course listed in the University [2001-2003 *Bulletin*] has been developed through appropriate academic channels and has been approved by the Board of Regents and the Coordinating Board. Any change in existing courses must be accomplished through the same procedures" (V-2).

Proposed curriculum changes are normally initiated at the department level and submitted to the appropriate college or school curriculum committee, which recommends changes to its dean for improvement of the educational programs in that college or school. Each undergraduate dean submits these recommendations to the University Curriculum Committee, which makes recommendations to the VPAA on the curriculum and academic programs. Acting on the recommendation of the VPAA, the President, when required, submits changes to the Board of Regents or other appropriate bodies for their review and approval.

The *Curriculum Change Guidelines*, February 2001, used by the University Curriculum Committee as its primary reference for making curriculum recommendations, provide a detailed description of how changes are initiated and reviewed, including the various categories of curricular changes and required approvals. All proposals are submitted on approved forms and adhere to the format prescribed by the THECB. The University Curriculum Committee electronically posts its agenda, minutes, and guidelines to ensure University-wide access to its deliberations (<http://quark.angelo.edu/~hamilton/UCC/index.html>).

The *Guidelines* also state

- (1) that the curriculum is a primary concern of the faculty, by whom changes are to be initiated;
- (2) that college and university curriculum committees, together with academic administrators, play an essential role in ensuring that proposed modifications to the curriculum are compatible with existing programs and with the mission of the University; and
- (3) [that the University] meets the reporting requirements of the Board of Regents and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

The composition of the various curriculum committees and the administration representatives who participate in the process demonstrate that all are afforded important roles in establishing changes in programs and curricula. For example, the College or School Curriculum Committees were established to ensure broad faculty participation in curriculum development and include the department head and one full-time faculty member from each academic department appointed by the dean who chairs the committee.

The President appoints members of the University Curriculum Committee recommended by the VPAA with the chair elected from among the full-time faculty committee members. Membership includes the deans of the Colleges and School, the Registrar, the Director of the Library, the President of the Faculty Senate, three faculty representatives from each college and one from the School of Education. The VPAA is responsible for approving or disapproving the recommendations submitted by the Committee. Approved recommendations are then sent to the President who forwards them to the Board of Regents (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, I-9).

Various external organizations and boards also contribute to the oversight of the curriculum. The State Board of Nurse Examiners, for example, regulates the curriculum in the nursing program. Also, the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) considers curricula in considering accreditation. Because the business program at ASU is accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), faculty credentials, teaching loads, and curriculum content have been developed to satisfy ACBSP standards. The departments affected by these standards include Accounting, Economics, and Finance; Computer Science; and Marketing and Management. Additionally, the Business Advisory Council, composed of local business leaders, provides input regarding curriculum. The School of Education follows standards prescribed by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC), the accreditation entity for Texas education programs. Student performance on the ExCET examinations also influences curriculum in the School of Education and, to a certain extent, in those departments with education certification components.

**For each major in a degree program, the institution must assign responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field.**

The University is in compliance.

The department head, an academically qualified faculty member in the field, assumes the primary responsibility for implementing and coordinating approved academic programs within the department with appropriate faculty input. These duties also include organizing departmental deliberations to review and develop curriculum (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, IV-33-34). The Dean of the College of Liberal and Fine Arts and the Dean of the College of Business and Professional Studies assume these responsibilities for the degree program in General Studies.

**At least one full-time faculty member with appropriate credentials, as defined in Section 4.8.2, must have primary teaching assignment in the major.**

The University is in compliance.

All degree programs at ASU identify a major. The *Summary of Institutional Data, Planning Resource Guide, 1999-2000* provides a list of teaching responsibilities and terminal degree status of each faculty member. An examination of these data reveals that each major at the University has at least one full-time faculty member with appropriate credentials having primary teaching assignment in that major. A detailed discussion of the academic and professional preparation of faculty members and their teaching assignments appears in 4.8.2.2, Faculty, Academic and Professional Preparation—Baccalaureate.

**The governing board must be responsible for approving the number and types of degrees; the number and nature of departments, divisions, schools or colleges through which the curriculum is administered; and the extent to which the institution should offer distance learning programs.**

The University is in compliance.

The Board of Regents of the Texas State University System, ASU's governing board, is responsible for approving all courses, programs, and degrees offered or proposed by the University. Additionally, the Board is responsible for approving all administrative units governing the curriculum (*Rules and Regulations of the Texas State University System Board of Regents*, I-1, I-6, III-17-18). This responsibility also covers such academic endeavors as distance learning programs discussed in detail in Section 5.1.7, Library/Learning Resources for Distance Learning Activities, and the Goodfellow Air Force Base educational program discussed in Appendix B.

As stipulated in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*, "No new department, school, degree program, or certificate program may be added at Angelo State University without prior approval of the Board of Regents and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Once approved, no department, school, degree program, or certificate program may be expanded to include subject matter courses that are

outside of approved degree and certificate programs except with specific prior approval of the Board of Regents and the Coordinating Board" (V-2). Furthermore, all major program changes have to be approved by and new ones have to be registered with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Bachelor of Fine Arts in Studio Art, a new undergraduate program approved by the University's Board of Regents and the THECB effective September 2000, is discussed in detail in the Departmental Inventory for the Department of Art and Music.

**The administration and faculty must be responsible for the development of academic programs recommended to the governing board.**

**They are also responsible for implementing and monitoring the general curriculum policy and the academic programs approved by the board. There should be an institution-wide process to coordinate programmatic and curricular changes. The institution should avoid the unwarranted proliferation of course offerings and degree programs. The development of new educational programs should be considered only after the institution has completed a needs assessment and has identified resources to support the programs. The institution should proceed only after careful review by appropriate faculty and administrative bodies, approval by the governing board, and any necessary review and approval by state or other agencies.**

The University is in compliance.

The responsibility for initiating and developing academic programs at ASU lies with the faculty and administration as described in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* (V-2). Identified as a Category IV change in the curriculum review process, the development of academic programs requires approval from both faculty and administration before submission to the Board of Regents, including the department head, College or School Curriculum Committee, Teacher Education Council (for changes affecting teacher certification programs), University Curriculum Committee, and VPAA (*Curriculum Change Guidelines*, February 2001).

The ASU *Academic Master Plan 2000* describes the University's philosophy regarding recent programmatic additions to the University curriculum: "Programs would actually go forward in a formal way only by a proposal initiated by a specific department. That is to say that it is assumed that commitment and enthusiasm for the proposal by the faculty who would implement a given program must be demonstrated. It would also be the responsibility of a proposing department to do a detailed and extensive needs assessment both for student interest and potential marketability for the program. A final responsibility of a proposing department would be consultation with other departments which might be affected by a proposal" (p. 11).

It is, therefore, standard procedure for the University to meet numerous additional criteria to justify the program to the Board of Regents. The program must be within the role of the institution and

should not unnecessarily duplicate programs at other system institutions. Faculty, library, and physical facilities must be adequate to support the program. The program should complement and strengthen existing programs and must demonstrate that it meets the present and future demands of the State. Finally, suitable financing to initiate and perpetuate the program must be demonstrated.

While most departments review and evaluate their curricula and degree programs every two years in conjunction with the preparation of the University *Bulletin*, ASU has also recently implemented an academic program review process to help ensure the formal, systematic review of all departmental programs on a regular cycle. Typically, curriculum committees are organized from the faculty in that program by the department head, who may or may not serve as the chair of the committee. The committee reviews the program and its curriculum, and may make suggestions or recommendations.

When asked how departments kept curricular content current, ten of nineteen cited these internal curriculum committees as a major component of their review process. Those that did not specifically cite such committees described other methods for monitoring their curricula including following professional society and licensing guidelines. For example, the School of Education and the Department of Mathematics both stated that curriculum was partly driven by student performance on ExCET examinations. The Department of Physics cited guidelines provided by the American Association of Physics Teachers; the Department of Nursing identified mandates issued by the Texas State Board of Nurse Examiners; and departments in the business program named standards required by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). All reporting departments had some level of program monitoring in place (*Departmental Inventories*).

**Curricula intended to provide basic preparation for students who will subsequently transfer to another institution must be designed to consider the institutions to which these students transfer. Associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions should work cooperatively to develop articulation agreements. The agreements should be evaluated periodically to ensure an equitable and efficient transfer of students.**

The University is in compliance.

The *2001-2003 Bulletin* provides information regarding pre-professional programs offered by Angelo State University in the following areas: pre-dental and pre-medical, pre-engineering, pre-law, pre-pharmacy, pre-occupational therapy, pre-physical therapy, and pre-veterinary. Students planning to transfer to institutions with these programs are assigned faculty advisors who are specific to departments associated with each of these professional areas and, therefore, who are well-informed regarding admission prerequisites and curricular requirements for each professional program (pp. 153-174, 257, 292, 297, 309, and 342).

When possible, the *2001-2003 Bulletin* identifies courses generally accepted in specialized programs at other institutions. Also, the University core curriculum, a group of State-mandated courses,

provides a common set of academic courses that will transfer to another institution to meet the particular pre-admission requirements at that school.

ASU has developed “two plus two” articulation agreements with a number of community and junior colleges. These agreements identify specific undergraduate courses that will transfer to the student’s program of study at ASU. All the agreements are managed and administered by the Office of Admissions and the Coordinator of Transfer Services and International Student Programs in conjunction with the Office of the VPAA and are subject to periodical evaluation by ASU as well as each community and junior college.

**“Inverted,” “two plus two” and similar programs must include an adequate amount of advanced coursework in the subject field.**

The University is in compliance.

ASU does not have “inverted” program agreements. The University does, however, have articulation agreements for “two plus two” programs with community and junior colleges and dual degree program agreements with three State universities. For both types of programs, ASU requires an adequate amount of advanced coursework in the subject field. Under the “two plus two” programs, transfer students complete their degree at ASU either after earning an associate degree or after earning a minimum of eighteen sch. In either case, students take the majority of advanced coursework in their program of study at ASU (Articulation Agreements). Students who participate in dual degree programs not only earn advanced hours in residence at ASU but also transfer advanced credit hours from the second university to complete graduation requirements at ASU. These students, therefore, earn at least as many, and often more, advanced credit hours in the subject field than students who pursue a traditional baccalaureate degree (Memoranda of Agreement Pertaining to Dual Degree Programs; *2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 291, 343).

**Institutions which enter into programmatic partnerships with secondary schools which result in the award of college credit, such as technical and dual enrollment programs, must ensure that the credit awarded is at the collegiate level and is in compliance with the *Criteria* and with Section IV in particular.**

The University is in compliance.

The same regulations as well as standards for course curriculum, grading, and instruction for university students are applicable to high school students participating in the dual-credit program at ASU. A Partnership for Award of Dual Course Credit Agreement has been completed between Angelo State University and the San Angelo Independent School District, Wall Independent School District, and Irion Independent School District. High school students from these districts who meet eligibility requirements and specific course prerequisites may enroll in two college-level courses per

semester chosen from the approved ASU course inventory, all of which are taught on campus by regular ASU faculty. In the case of students with exceptional academic abilities capable of college-level work as specified in the Partnership Agreement, ASU may occasionally grant exceptions to this requirement.

Courses offered for dual credit are the same courses available to regularly enrolled students. ASU also maintains the same evaluation standards for instructional effectiveness and learning outcomes for courses in which students may earn dual credit as it does for all other courses. Instructors teaching courses that result in the award of dual credit must meet the same standards used by the University to select all faculty.

**Partnerships must be evaluated regularly by the participating institution of higher education.**

**The participating institution must assume full responsibility for the academic quality and integrity of partnerships as measured by the *Criteria*.**

The University is in compliance.

The Office of Admissions and Retention is responsible for evaluating dual-credit partnerships. While evaluation of the partnerships has occurred since their inception, it has been conducted informally by the Associate Director of Admissions, who contacted appropriate personnel at participating high schools each spring to identify available courses, to make arrangements for a presentation to interested students, and to discuss the program in general.

To evaluate the partnerships more systematically, the Office of Admissions and Retention has developed a formal process, including evaluations from the counselors at each participating high school, from ASU faculty members who teach courses in which dual-credit students are enrolled, and from students enrolled in the program. This process was implemented at the close of the spring 2001 semester; subsequent evaluations will be conducted at the conclusion of each regular semester (Dual Credit Early Admission Evaluation).

As stipulated in the *Partnership for Award of Dual Course Credit Agreement*, “The same policies, regulations and standards for course curriculum, grading and instruction for university students [are] applicable to high school students participating in the dual credit program.” ASU, therefore, assumes full responsibility for ensuring both the quality and integrity of this program.

### Section 4.2.3: Recommendations and Suggestions

Having determined that the University complies with all the criteria for the Undergraduate Curriculum, the Self-Study Steering Committee makes no recommendations. The Committee, however, offers the following suggestion:

1. Implementation of the University-wide Academic Program Review Process should continue.

### 4.2.4 Undergraduate Instruction

**Instructional techniques and policies must be in accord with the purpose of the institution and be appropriate to the specific goals of an individual course.**

The University is in compliance.

Several statements of purpose address undergraduate instructional techniques and reveal how seriously the University takes its teaching function in preparing well-educated citizens of Texas:

1. The University's mission statement details the major components that define the importance of ASU's educational purpose.
2. The *State Strategic Plan 2001-2005* identifies the State's priority goal for higher education: "to provide an affordable, accessible, and quality system of higher education that prepares individuals for a changing economy and workforce, and that furthers the development and application of knowledge through instruction and research" (3).
3. ASU's agency policy in the same document states the commitment to provide "a stimulating educational climate which will offer students maximum opportunities for academic and personal growth" (6).

Teaching techniques used across the campus support these statements. Information about teaching methods and styles derives from the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) group summary reports of the annual required student assessments of instruction, and the faculty at Angelo State University use a variety of instructional approaches in the classroom and self-report their primary and secondary methods of instruction on the IDEA forms. Table 4.2.4.a (Fall 2000) records representative approaches used across the campus.

**Table 4.2.4.a: IDEA Form Summary of Primary and Secondary Instructional Approaches**

	Primary Approach		Secondary Approach	
	N	%	N	%
Lecture	372	47	74	9
Discussion/recitation	52	7	161	20
Seminar	24	3	2	0
Skill/activity	108	14	112	14
Laboratory	13	2	61	8
Field Experience	4	1	13	2
Studio	13	2	0	0
Multi-Media	0	0	18	2
Practicum/clinic	15	2	7	1
Other/Not Indicated	185	24	338	43

Because students must enroll in a variety of core curriculum and major-based classes during their academic preparation, it is clear that they are exposed to a variety of instructional techniques as they continue their undergraduate studies.

An equally important component of instruction concerns the kinds of academic activities present in each course. Table 4.2.4.b below, also from fall 2000, shows the degree to which classes at ASU expose students to a variety of activities to develop the skills needed after graduation.

**Table 4.2.4.b**

**IDEA Form Summary, Course Emphases**

	Number Rating Emphasis	Amount Required					
		None or little		Some		Much	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Writing	591	189	32	280	47	122	21
Oral Communications	585	189	32	251	43	145	25
Computer applications	588	356	61	170	29	62	11
Group work	584	271	46	221	38	92	16
Mathematical/quantitative work	583	382	66	89	15	112	19
Critical thinking	596	91	15	273	46	232	39
Creative/artistic/design	587	419	71	125	21	43	7

Instruction is conducted at ASU in a professional and varied manner. In the Self-Study Undergraduate Student Survey, 85.7% agreed or strongly agreed that instructional methods were appropriate to course goals, and 80.7% agreed or strongly agreed that methods were appropriate to student capabilities.

Students agree, but not as strongly, that there are a variety of methods used to evaluate student performance (63.7%), that appropriate methods are used to evaluate students (69.9%), and that instructor evaluations reflect concern for quality (67.1%). At the same time, students agree or strongly agree that instructors properly grade student performance (76.8%) and that their grades are consistent with published grading policies (89.1%).

**Instruction must be evaluated regularly and the results used to ensure quality instruction.**

The University is in compliance.

Instruction at Angelo State University is evaluated regularly and the results are used to ensure quality instruction. The University administers both long and short IDEA assessments each fall and spring semester, and all instructors are required to participate. Data collected from the students surveyed are tallied by the IDEA Center at Kansas State University, which returns the results to all faculty members. Group summary reports are distributed to department heads, deans, VPAA, and President. Department heads use the data as part of the required annual performance evaluation of each faculty member. Additionally, the teaching quality of non-tenured faculty is one of several items addressed each year by the annual performance evaluation. Department heads rely either on classroom visitation or the statistical data from the IDEA forms—or both—and must include an assessment of teaching quality. If teaching quality is weak, the department head counsels the instructor and attempts to identify problems and suggest solutions. Tenured members of the faculty are evaluated in a similar way, but usually without classroom visitation. In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation for tenured faculty, the post-tenure review procedure outlined on pp. IV-26-28 of the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* is used. In both cases, the department head's evaluation of teaching quality is part of a recommendation for reappointment.

All department heads at ASU teach, and their teaching function is assessed annually by the appropriate academic dean. The quality of the department head's teaching is part of the dean's recommendation for reappointment.

Only 57.4% of students responding to the Undergraduate Student Survey agree or strongly agree that they have regular opportunities to evaluate instructors; some 35.8% disagree or are not sure that they have this opportunity. This is probably a misperception on the part of the students. All courses are regularly evaluated in the fall semester, and courses not previously evaluated may be surveyed in the spring. For example, an instructor teaching a section of English 1301 in the fall and in the spring would have only the fall course evaluated unless he or she specifically asked to have the spring section evaluated; any new course the instructor taught in the spring would be evaluated. Should the instructor choose not to have the spring section evaluated, students in that section might think that their instructor is not being evaluated.

**Students must be provided written information about the goals and requirements of each course, the nature of the course content, and the methods of evaluation to be employed.**

The University is in compliance.

The *Faculty-Staff Handbook* directs all faculty to provide written information about the method of evaluation used in each class as well as the basis for the final grade (V-9). All students at Angelo State University are also routinely provided written information about the goals and requirements of each course, about the course content, and about the methods of evaluation. Each class at the University follows a published syllabus provided by the instructor, which may be printed and distributed at the beginning of class or published on the instructor's web site; in any case, students can readily obtain all relevant information about the course for which they are enrolled. Copies of printed syllabi are available in each departmental office and with the supporting documentation for Section 4.2; department web sites with links to individual instructors' sites may be found at <http://www.angelo.edu/dept/> or <http://www.angelo.edu/faculty>. All syllabi for 2001-2002 are on file in the Self-Study office.

All responses to the Self-Study Undergraduate Student Survey questions in this area were very positive: 90.6% agreed or strongly agreed that they were given information about course goals, 95.5% were told of course requirements, 85.4% were informed about methods of evaluation in the course, and 91.0% were told about the nature of course content.

**Methods of instruction must be appropriate to the goals of each course and the capabilities of the students.**

The University is in compliance.

The faculty makes every effort to ensure that classroom methodology is appropriate to the goals of the class and the capabilities of the students. Methods of instruction for developmental courses, for example, are not the same as those for standard or upper-division courses, as evidenced by the careful development of English 130C and Mathematics 130A and 130B. The *ASU Developmental Education Plan* (Spring 2000), which details the policies, procedures, and standards for the institution's developmental education program, provides for a level of quality in instruction to address the needs of "students lacking the verbal and quantitative skills necessary to pursue a baccalaureate degree successfully" (1). The University also provides support for students with special needs through the counseling services in the University Clinic and through the Office of Educational Opportunity Services. In addition, an Honors Council was reactivated in response to the recommendation in the *Academic Master Plan 2000* that "a committee perform an extensive study of the interest, desirability, feasibility, and potential structure" of an honors program (13). To date, a Director has been hired and is working with the Dean's Council to develop admission standards and curricula for the Honors

Program. Additionally, recruitment activities are underway in anticipation of the program's inauguration in the fall 2002 semester.

Student response to the faculty's choice of instructional methods is notably positive as indicated in the IDEA Form Institutional Summary. They consistently rated teaching methods a strength in those courses in which the methods were identified as relevant, that is significantly related to progress on important or essential objectives (Table 4.2.4.c).

Table 4.2.4.c

Teaching Methods and Styles

Teaching Methods and Styles	No. of Classes	Avg.	s. d. <sup>1</sup>	% of Classes Where Method is Classified as a "Weakness" (■) or a "Strength" (□)
<b>A. Student-Faculty Contact</b>				
1. Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning	236	4.3	0.5	
2. Found ways to help students answer their own questions	266	4.2	0.5	
20. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e-mail, etc.)	159	4.0	0.6	
<b>B. Involving Students</b>				
5. Formed "teams" or "discussion groups" to facilitate learning	253	3.5	1.1	
9. Encouraged students to use multiple resources (e.g. data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding	207	3.8	0.7	
14. Involved students in "hands on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities	207	3.7	0.9	
16. Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own	195	3.6	0.8	
18. Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts	267	3.8	0.7	
<b>C. Establishing Expectations</b>				
3. Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up to date in their work	295	4.3	0.4	
4. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter	259	4.4	0.4	
8. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses	295	4.0	0.6	
13. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject	283	4.0	0.6	
15. Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them	166	3.8	0.6	
<b>D. Clarity of Communication</b>				
6. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course	271	4.2	0.5	
10. Explained course material clearly and concisely	234	4.2	0.5	
11. Related course material to real life situations	276	4.2	0.6	
<b>E. Assessment/Feedback</b>				
7. Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance	253	3.8	0.6	
12. Gave tests, projects, etc. that covered the most important points of the course	294	4.3	0.5	
17. Provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help students improve	231	4.1	0.6	
19. Gave projects, tests or assignments that required original or creative thinking	284	4.0	0.7	

<sup>1</sup> Approximately two-thirds of class averages will be within ±1 standard deviation of the group's average.

Students responding to the Self-Study Undergraduate Student Survey also agree that instructional methods are appropriate both to course goals and to student capabilities (Table 4.2.4.d).

**Table 4.2.4.d**

**Undergraduate Student Responses, Classes**

**1= SD-Strongly Disagree**  
**2=D-Disagree**  
**3=NS-Not Sure**  
**4=A-Agree**  
**5=SA-Strongly Agree**

<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Item</b> <i>In my classes at ASU,</i>	<b>% SD</b>	<b>% D</b>	<b>% NS</b>	<b>% A</b>	<b>% SA</b>
3.96	0.75	instruction methods are appropriate to course goals	0.4	6.8	7.1	67.7	18.0
3.86	0.83	instruction methods are appropriate to student capabilities	1.5	7.5	10.2	64.5	16.2

**Experimentation with methods to improve instruction must be adequately supported and critically evaluated.**

The University is in compliance.

The University encourages faculty experimentation in instructional pedagogy both on an informal basis as well as through more formal opportunities. Faculty concur with 58.9 % agreeing or strongly agreeing that such opportunities are adequately supported and only 17.3% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing (Self-Study Faculty Survey).

Individually, faculty members are engaged in various activities to improve instruction. For example, the Department of English continues to develop technology applications for composition and literature classes. Other faculty report experimentation to assess the effect that active learning strategies have on college students’ achievement, motivation, and self-efficiency (Biology 2424) and experimentation to assess multimedia instruction in the large lecture class compared to the traditional transmission model (Physical Science 3101).

Faculty developing multimedia presentations and interactive learning modules have at their disposal the Multimedia Instructional Support Center, whose staff provides assistance in design services, appropriate hardware applications, and other technical areas. The University also has a satellite down link available to provide educational programming in courses where appropriate as well as enable

satellite-delivered AV conferencing. Section 5.2 of this report, Instructional Support and Information Technology, provides a detailed discussion of the University's facilities and instructional support services for faculty and students.

More formal opportunities for experimentation are identified in the *Faculty Development Handbook 2000-2001*. These programs, discussed in detail in Section 4.8.7, Professional Growth, encourage experimentation in innovative teaching methods:

1. The Faculty Development and Enrichment Program specifies that funds "shall be used primarily to upgrade and enhance the quality of teaching by faculty and for the improvement of the content and quality of the instructional programs of the University" (8). All four of the programs and projects supported by these funds are designed to contribute to instructional development and quality of teaching.
2. Technology Development Grants are awarded to those teaching distance-learning classes or for instructional re-design and conversion of course materials.
3. Faculty Development Funds are available from the VPAA's office to support full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty presenting a paper that emphasizes innovative teaching at a major national or regional professional organization or association.
4. Grants are available for faculty members to attend the annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching. Since 1995, ASU has sent 42 faculty members to annual or regional conferences.
5. Departmental Travel Funds are available from M and O funds to support individual travel to conferences and presentations. Further support may also be available from the deans' discretionary funds.

Individual experimentation in the classroom is subject to the pragmatic evaluation of both student and peer review. More formal evaluation also occurs. Recipients of technology grants as well as recipients of grants awarded under the Faculty Development and Enrichment Program and the Research Enhancement Program must submit progress reports to the VPAA and may be asked to share the results with their departments, colleges or school, or the university community at large. Additionally, students have the opportunity to evaluate the strength or weakness of teaching methods and styles through the IDEA Form used for course evaluations.

The most recent Institutional Summary of student response to this category supports the effectiveness of the various classroom methodologies (see Table 7). However, faculty response to the critical evaluation of experimentation based on the Self-Study Faculty Survey appears less positive. While 58.9% of faculty members agree or strongly agree that such evaluation takes place, 40.3% are unsure and 24% disagree or strongly disagree. Faculty in the latter two categories may be unaware that their students and peers comprise a form of critical evaluation, that critical analysis is available from the IDEA Report, and that formal evaluation is a component of most of the formal development opportunities offered by the University.

**An institution must use a variety of means to evaluate student performance.**

The University is in compliance.

The faculty, while “free to develop their own methods of evaluating the performance of students in their courses,” typically rely on traditional testing and grading practices standard in each discipline, including “class participation, examinations, reports, and compositions” (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, V-9). In some departments, students are also evaluated through other procedures, particularly some form of field work or portfolios. In the Departments of Nursing and Aerospace Studies and the School of Education, student progress is also evaluated by measures mandated by State or federal authorities. Responses to the Self-Study Faculty Survey indicate that 67.3% of the faculty agree or strongly agree that they use various methods to evaluate student performance in their classes.

**The evaluation must reflect concern for quality and properly discern levels of student performance.**

The University is in compliance.

The University recognizes the importance of effective evaluation across the instructional program. The responsibility for assuring adequate methods of evaluation rests with the department head and is subject to administrative review (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, V-9).

Students agree that evaluation is appropriate and reflects levels of performance. The cumulative 1992-2001 results of the American College Testing Program (ACT) Student Opinion Survey indicate a ten-year average of 3.88 (on a scale of 1 to 5) for Testing/Grading System, which exceeds both the public college sample (3.81) and the national sample (3.83). Student response based on the Self-Study Undergraduate Student Survey is also positive, with 68.9% agreeing or strongly agreeing that appropriate methods are used to evaluate students, and 67.1% agreeing or strongly agreeing that instructor evaluations reflect concern for quality.

**An institution must publish its grading policies, and its grading practices must be consistent with policy.**

The University is in compliance.

The University publishes its system of grading and related policies in the *2001-2003 Bulletin* (pp. 142-144). While grading policies in individual courses vary among instructors and courses, these policies are identified on the individual course syllabi and, in some instances, on individual course web pages. Additionally, all nineteen departments teaching undergraduate courses report that they maintain files

of course syllabi for each class, which are available to faculty and anyone interested in reviewing them (*Departmental Inventories*).

Students also have the opportunity to review grading practices as they relate to policy through their responses on the IDEA Form as discussed previously. When asked specifically to evaluate the extent to which grading practices reflect policy, students responding to the Undergraduate Student Survey indicated their satisfaction with 89.1% agreeing or strongly agreeing.

**The institution must evaluate the effectiveness of its instructional program by a variety of techniques, which may include the following: use of standardized tests and comprehensive examinations, assessment of the performance of graduates in advanced programs or employment, and sampling of the opinions of former students.**

The University is in compliance.

Angelo State University uses a variety of techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of its instructional program including the Institutional Effectiveness System, standardized tests, comprehensive examinations, graduation surveys, and alumni surveys. Section 3.1, Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs, provides a detailed discussion of the means by which the University evaluates the quality and effectiveness of its undergraduate programs.

Under the direction of the Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness, the University assesses each program annually through the online Institutional Effectiveness System by which each department head posts objectives, means of assessment, criteria for success, assessment results, and ways the department will use the results to improve the program or service. Each academic program summary, printed from this system, is reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Advisory Committee, which notes problem areas and suggests changes to be implemented during the following year. The VPAA reports to the President those academic deficiencies identified in the Institutional Effectiveness plans and by the Institutional Effectiveness Advisory Committee.

Each department handles its suggested improvements differently. Some appoint a committee to discuss improvements while some review the improvements as a whole department. The department head or an appointed faculty member implements the recommended changes. The departments report changes to the Coordinator for Institutional Effectiveness, who compiles a progress report for the President.

The Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT) is administered every semester in business, accounting, economics, finance, biology, chemistry, computer science, English, history, government, and mathematics. Based on the test results, departments have made changes to course sequencing and content as well as overall curriculum. Students seeking teacher certification through the School of Education take the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) during the final

semester of coursework or after graduation. Changes are made to the curriculum and to course sequencing based on the results of the licensing examination (*Departmental Inventories*).

Information on the effectiveness of the undergraduate programs is collected in the Graduation Survey. According to the Executive Summary of the Graduation Survey Results for Academic Year 2001, "Overall, curriculum items reflected that respondents felt adequately prepared by their educational experiences at ASU." Specifically, 19.6% of respondents indicated they had applied to graduate or professional school. Of that number, 75% were accepted. In addition, 59% of respondents indicated they had applied for employment relevant to their major with 50.1% indicating that they were hired. Departments also use the Alumni Surveys to determine how many graduates have applied and are accepted for graduate or professional school and how many graduates are employed in the major field. Combining the surveys for 1993-1994 and 1995-1996, the median response for how well the major prepared the student for graduate school was 1.99 on the scale: 1 = Very Well, 5 = Poorly. The same surveys revealed a median response of 2.30 for how well the major prepared the student for a job. On the 2000-2001 Alumni Survey, the median response for how well the major prepared the student for graduate/professional school was 4 on a scale that ranged from 1—not well, 3—adequate, 5—very well. On the same survey, the median response for how well the major prepared the student for professional employment was 4.

During the 2001 spring semester, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered for the first time to a random sample of freshmen and seniors with a 30% response rate (206 students: 81 freshmen and 125 seniors). Results indicated that, overall, responses of students were statistically comparable to those from other Master's I and II institutions, although most ASU means were a bit lower numerically. Five items (seven means), however, were statistically lower than the comparison group means in the Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences section, the Reading and Writing section, and the Emphasis on Mental Activities section. While the data were not available for a close analysis of their implications in time for this self-study, the somewhat disappointing survey results merit further review by the University during the 2001-2002 academic year.

**Courses offered in non-traditional formats, e.g., concentrated or abbreviated time periods, must be designed to ensure an opportunity for preparation, reflection and analysis concerning the subject matter.**

**The institution must demonstrate that students completing these programs or courses have acquired equivalent levels of knowledge and competencies as to those acquired in more traditional formats.**

Because ASU does not offer undergraduate courses in non-traditional formats, these criteria are not applicable.

**Effective instruction depends largely upon the maintenance of an environment conducive to study and learning. Therefore, an institution of higher education must provide for its students a learning environment in which scholarly and creative achievement is encouraged.**

The University is in compliance.

ASU is committed to provide students an education by which they can reach their potential in academics and creativity. To accomplish this, the University maintains an environment that supports scholarly and creative achievement.

Financial scholarships are one means by which ASU encourages scholarship and creativity. The Carr Academic Scholarship program awards students who excel in academics by providing monetary support to approximately 900 students. One hundred Carr Air Force ROTC Scholarships are awarded on the basis of scholarship and leadership. The University Financial Aid Committee awards approximately 750 other scholarships on the basis of need, special ability, or special interest.

In addition to financial awards, the University formally recognizes academic success and encourages students to strive for excellence. The Dean's List acknowledges students who achieve a 3.25 grade point average each semester; and at graduation, honors are conferred on students who have at least a 3.5 grade point average. The Presidential Award recognizes the University's most outstanding student. Additionally, each college and school acknowledges its outstanding student with the Most Distinguished Student Award.

The University also attempts to facilitate the learning of those who may not have previously received adequate educational opportunities during elementary and/or secondary school. The Language Learning Center is available to assist students in developing reading and writing skills while the mathematics lab supports developmental mathematics instruction.

Opportunities for research courses are offered in a variety of departments to allow students to investigate particular subjects of interest within their field under faculty supervision. Additionally, the University offers the Robert G. Carr and Nona K. Carr Student Research Scholarships to fund research projects for worthy undergraduates. Projects selected for funding are presented annually at the Carr Student Research Scholar Symposium. Recipients of this award are identified as Carr Research Fellows, a designation noted on their transcripts.

In an attempt to encourage and display students' creative achievements, events are scheduled throughout the academic year, including regular concerts and dramatic performances such as the Madrigal Dinner and the Dinner Theatre, as well as frequent art exhibitions. These functions also serve to create an awareness of and appreciation for the arts among students as well as the university faculty and staff and the local community. The University Center Program Council schedules musical

performances, theatrical events, and speeches on campus by non-University affiliated individuals, groups, and organizations. The University also supports students with an interest in writing. The campus newspaper, the *ASU RamPage*, and the literary journal, *Oasis*, provide in-house media for the distribution of students' journalistic, literary, and artistic accomplishments.

The University and its components continually invite prominent scholars and artists to campus to expose students, faculty, and staff to different academic and artistic viewpoints. The University supports the *Symposium on American Values*, which addresses national values. Regular lecture series and conferences such as the *Moon Distinguished Lectureship in Science*, the *Wells Fargo Distinguished Lectureship in Business*, the *Dr. Ralph R. Chase Lectureship in the Humanities*, the *International Business Symposium*, and the *ASU Writers Conference in Honor of Elmer Kelton* further serve to broaden students' academic horizons. The *AEP/West Texas Utilities Distinguished Professor in Residence Program* not only exposes students to a prominent intellect but also allows them to know the individual on a day-to-day basis. Individual departments also contribute to students' intellectual growth by inviting guest speakers to address issues relevant to particular fields of study.

The University's physical facilities also support academic and creative achievement. The ACT Student Opinion Survey reveals that ASU's physical facilities are highly rated. Survey items included the University's classroom facilities, the general condition of buildings and grounds, laboratory facilities, study areas, computer services, and library facilities and services. ASU's facilities rated significantly higher in both the 2001 ratings and the respective ten-year averages than those of either the public college sample or the national sample.

As a significant part of these physical facilities, computer and information technology support student achievement and are constantly being upgraded. There are seven computer laboratories containing three hundred computers across campus supported by Information Technology. Most of these labs have projectors and other equipment to facilitate hands-on instruction for students. The labs have a variety of technological set-ups, some podium based, which accommodate various teaching styles. There are also over two hundred computers in individual departmental labs serving specialized needs. These labs are supported by Information Technology but operated by the individual departments. Over two hundred different software packages are available in the laboratory facilities across campus. Access to computing facilities and various software packages as well as assistance using these resources is also crucial. One computer laboratory is open twenty-four hours, with a modified weekend schedule. The Information Technology Help Desk is accessible on this same schedule to assist individuals on and off campus with technology-related questions.

Technology is continually advancing, and Information Technology strives to bring new developments into the University environment. A distance-learning laboratory is available with see-you, see-me technology, and a multimedia lab provides access to digital video and still cameras as well as computers with AV editing capabilities. Over 50% of the University's eight hundred residence hall rooms are currently wired to the University's computer network, with plans for the remaining rooms

to be connected to the network within the next twelve to eighteen months contingent upon funding. Dial-up network access and a proxy server are available for off-campus students, and wireless technologies are currently being implemented on a trial basis on some parts of campus.

ASU's physical resources, such as the Houston Harte University Center, athletic facilities, planetarium, and lake house, are important to student life. The Porter Henderson Library, in particular, supports the University's curriculum as well as specific topics of local, State, and regional interest. Furthermore, the Library houses a diverse collection of over 1,400,000 items (including periodicals, books, and multimedia), and provides direct student access from on and off campus to over 150 online informational databases, many of which contain full-text documents. Students, faculty, and staff may access items that the Porter Henderson Library does not own through the Library's efficient interlibrary loan services. The Library also provides over twenty computer workstations for students; houses an instruction classroom, where students are taught how to access, locate, evaluate, and use information in a variety of different formats; and provides a facility with equipment to view and play various multimedia formats. The Dr. Ralph R. Chase West Texas Collection, located in the University Center, houses books, documents, photographs, and other historical materials pertaining to the immediate and West Texas geographic area, people, and other subject matter of local interest.

In addition to the physical resources, the University also supports approximately seventy-five student organizations that operate on campus including a variety of student honor societies, including Alpha Lambda Delta (freshmen) and Alpha Chi National Honor Scholarship Society (juniors and seniors). Some financial assistance is provided to these organizations for off-campus travel to attend events and competitions such as debate tournaments, agricultural judging competitions, computer programming competitions, as well as other events.

To produce an environment that encourages exposure to alternative cultures, lifestyles, and viewpoints, the University actively supports the development of a diverse student body made up of individuals with a variety of ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. To help develop such a population, the Office of Educational Opportunity Services works to recruit and retain diverse groups by providing mentoring services, academic counseling, and scholarship referral. The University also offers students the chance to learn about other nations and cultures through its international education programs. Study abroad programs are offered annually in France, Germany, Mexico, and the United Kingdom, and in summer 2001, a program in Greece was reactivated for education students. The University also has student exchange programs with the University of Lüneburg and University of Hannover in Germany, Université du Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis in France, Heriot-Watt University in Scotland, and Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey Campus Chihuahua in Mexico. A detailed discussion of the international education program appears in Appendix 4-1 to the Undergraduate Program.

**In certain professional, vocational and technical programs (for example, allied health areas), clinical and other affiliations with outside agencies may be necessary. In all such cases, learning experiences for which credit is awarded must be under the ultimate control and supervision of the educational institution.**

The University is in compliance.

At ASU, the Department of Nursing and the School of Education require practical experiences in association with outside entities. Without exception, these learning experiences are under the ultimate control and supervision of the University.

Under its contractual agreements with participating health care agencies, the Department of Nursing provides for the teaching, guidance, and evaluation of students, among other responsibilities while the agencies agree to provide the physical facilities for clinical activities and to help coordinate experiences and observational opportunities (Agreement for Use of Clinical Facilities with the Department of Nursing). ASU's ultimate control and supervision of these clinical practica for nursing students are also detailed in the *Preceptor Handbook*, which states that "the faculty member will have primary responsibility for the student's clinical learning experience and will serve as the liaison between the Department of Nursing and agency" (p. 8).

The School of Education is responsible for supervising and evaluating the field experience required of students seeking certification. The *Student Teaching Handbook*, which contains the policies, procedures, and expectations of all participants in the student teaching program, documents the ultimate control and supervision of the program as residing with the School of Education.

**The institution must demonstrate that an effective relationship exists between curricular content and current practices in the field of specialization.**

The University is in compliance.

To develop a curriculum that relates to students' future professional or academic endeavors, all changes and additions to curricula are subject to review within the appropriate University college or school, as well as at the University level and by the Board of Regents. Various programs such as accounting, economics, finance, music, nursing, and management and marketing are accredited by subject-specific accrediting bodies, and must meet the curricular guidelines of these bodies. Furthermore, the School of Education and the nursing program are accredited by applicable State Boards. Several departments have also established lay advisory boards or committees to provide links between the departments and appropriate representatives of the community. The names and responsibilities of selected advisory bodies are discussed in detail in Section 6.1.3, Administrative Processes, Advisory Committees.

Students agree that their academic preparation is appropriate and effective. When asked on the ACT Student Opinion Survey about the preparation they are receiving for their future occupations, students responded with a positive rating of 3.80 on the 2001 Survey and a cumulative ten-year average of 3.77. Student satisfaction with the course content in their major field of study is also positive with a rating of 3.99 on the 2001 Survey and a cumulative ten-year average of 3.88.

The University also conducts surveys of its alumni who have received baccalaureate degrees. These responses are particularly important because they reflect the students' evaluation of their educational preparation after having gained employment or having embarked on further educational opportunities. Of graduates responding to the 2000-2001 Alumni Survey, 71% were currently employed in a subject area relevant to their major, and 30% had applied for admission to graduate/professional school with 98% having been accepted. When asked how well the education they received in their majors prepared them for professional employment and for graduate/professional school, the alumni rated their academic training a 4 (on a scale of 1 [low] to 5 [high]) with regard to preparation for both employment and graduate school.

**An institution must demonstrate that program length, clock hours or credit hours, and tuition and fee charges are appropriate for the degrees and credentials it offers.**

The University is in compliance.

The University demonstrates the appropriateness of program length, clock or credit hours, and tuition and fee charges for the degrees offered by the same process followed for course approval, which is described in detail earlier. These matters must be approved at all levels, including department, college or school, University, Board of Regents, and finally the THECB.

Of particular note are the affordable tuition and fee charges at ASU for the degrees offered. In-state tuition based on a nine-month term for a fulltime undergraduate student enrolled for fifteen hours and living off campus is \$1,200 (\$40 per credit hour) while required fees are \$1,300 for a total of \$2,500 (Tuition and Fee Schedule).

**Section 4.2.4: Recommendations and Suggestions**

Having determined that the University complies with all of the requirements for Undergraduate Instruction, the Self-Study Steering Committee makes no recommendations. The Committee does, however, offer the following suggestions:

1. Identify means for communicating to faculty the various evaluation processes, both pragmatic and formal, currently in place for the evaluation of experimentation to improve methods of instruction in the classroom.

2. Determine ways to improve student response overall and specifically in the Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences section, the amount of Reading and Writing section, and the Emphasis on Mental Activities section based on a close analysis of data generated from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

#### 4.2.5 Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students

**Each institution must conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising. A qualified advisor should be assigned early in the student's program and should recognize the individuality of students and their particular needs and goals. Advisors should be proficient in using data to help determine students' major fields of interest, should have access to each advisee's records, and should have appropriate training or background and experience to carry out their responsibilities effectively.**

The University is in compliance.

According to the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*, "Each enrolled student [who has declared a major] is assigned to a faculty advisor in the major field. The advisor is expected to be familiar with information in the [2001-2003 *Bulletin*] and is responsible for general counseling with the assigned student" (V-16). The *Faculty-Staff Handbook* also notes that "[s]tudents who are reported with academic deficiencies are counseled by their academic deans in consultation with the head of the major department" (V-16). Academic advising is available to all students before registration and during the pre-registration periods.

Undeclared majors are assigned alphabetically to one of approximately thirty faculty who have been selected from each college or school by the respective dean. The undeclared major faculty advisors are listed in the class schedule before each registration period.

ASU uses a decentralized system for advising in which each academic department maintains an effective advising process tailored to the needs and goals of its students. Students new to ASU have the option of participating in Preview ASU, a major orientation and advising activity, and a majority choose to do so. Those students who do not choose to participate are enrolled in first-semester classes with advising offered by the Office of Admissions and Retention or an appropriate academic department.

Once a student enrolls, a faculty member is assigned no later than the pre-registration period for the next semester. Academic advising is conducted during these pre-registration periods. Additionally, students are strongly encouraged to apply for a formal degree plan once they choose a major. At that time, the student meets with an advisor, reviews the remaining coursework, and discusses career options. A student cannot graduate without an approved degree plan. In conjunction with the recent

addition of the On-Course Automated Degree Plan System (On-Course), a student must also receive an advisor's approval to enroll in classes.

While the advising system at ASU is systematic, effective, and continuously improving, some weaknesses still exist. ASU has made extensive progress integrating technology into the advising process. For example, all faculty now have online access to student records (IA-Plus Online System), and all faculty and students have online access to student degree plans (On-Course Automated Degree Plan System). Additionally, computerized enrollment is designed to prevent students from enrolling in classes without meeting the required prerequisites.

In their responses to several questions regarding undergraduate advising in the *Departmental Inventories*, including the manner in which each department advised students, department heads identified a number of different methods. For example, students may be assigned to full-time faculty according to their interests, discipline, or specialty area. Students may also be assigned alphabetically according to the first letter in their last name. In general, departments tailor advising methodologies to meet the needs and goals of their students.

Department heads were also asked to describe the training of faculty advisors. They noted the advising process has changed over the past several years because of technological advances (e.g., telephone registration, online registration, registration access codes, and electronic degree plans), and they have typically addressed these changes as needed at faculty meetings. Detailed descriptions of the advising system have been made available to faculty advisors, and the Registrar's Office provides formal training sessions to all faculty on the use of the University's student record system and the On-Course Automated Degree Plan System.

Information Technology also provides training to assist faculty in becoming proficient in using advising software. More experienced faculty typically mentor new advisors, and the department heads also assist new faculty in learning and understanding their role. Department heads may also provide additional training as needed.

On-Course provides up-to-date information for the faculty advisor and student. The advisors have the ability to create a "what if" scenario for the student in the event the student is undecided about his or her goals. Once students have applied for a degree plan through their respective college, they may view their progress toward completing their degree by accessing On-Course (Degree Audit) through the RAMS link on the ASU web site. The degree audit shows courses completed, courses in progress, courses not applicable, courses yet to be taken, cumulative GPA, major GPA, and course grades.

Full use of On-Course began during the 2000 fall semester with the College of Sciences, the College of Liberal and Fine Arts, and the College of Business and Professional Studies. Within these three Colleges, 89% of the degree plans were filed using On-Course in its first semester of operation. During the 2000 fall semester, the School of Education did not fully use On-Course because the

School was recently formed and had many administrative adjustments to make, but it did begin to use the system during the 2001 spring semester. Other exceptions to the use of On-Course during the 2000 fall semester included some students pursuing double majors, students pursuing a second baccalaureate degree, and students requiring extensive modifications to their degree plan. With regard to future modifications, the colleges using On-Course have requested a more streamlined audit process. Approximately 95% of all degree plans are currently auditable on line.

Academic Year and Summer Provisional Admission students, those most often identified as being at risk academically, are advised by staff members in the Office of Admissions and Retention, which includes the Office of Educational Opportunity Services. These students are encouraged to make an appointment for advising before early registration periods or at the start of the semester, and may also be advised during Preview ASU. Office of Admissions and Retention staff members charged with the responsibility of advising attend a Preview ASU undergraduate advisor training session. This advising system, however, excludes faculty from participating with these students in making important academic decisions by delegating advising responsibilities to staff members during these students' initial year or summer session at ASU.

ASU also provides individualized orientation and advising services to its international students. A one-day international student orientation session is held in August before the beginning of the fall semester, during which the international students are provided with the opportunity to meet other international students and the administrative staff; tour the campus; receive information about ASU services, programs, and regulations; receive individual academic advising from faculty representing the academic departments; and register for their fall classes.

While the University's current system of undergraduate academic advising is systematic and effective, there is room for improvement. The current system is decentralized, and academic departments use different advising methods. Numerous changes have also taken place in recent years because of technological advances. The *Academic Master Plan 2000* offers specific recommendations regarding the academic advising of undergraduate students, including establishing a Center for Academic Excellence to manage student advising, counseling, and retention with special attention to at-risk students; to continue and refine pre-enrollment advising programs; and to provide orientation programs for all registration periods through which all new students would be provided academic advising and introduction to campus facilities (pp. 9-10). The components of the Center for Academic Excellence are currently in place or under development.

**An institution must ensure that the number of advisees assigned to faculty or professional staff is reasonable.**

The University is in compliance.

The *Departmental Inventories* indicate that the number of undergraduate students assigned to faculty range from a low of approximately ten to a high of approximately eighty. This range is determined by the number of faculty and majors within each department. The manner in which students are assigned to faculty for advising varies by department. In some, students are assigned based on their discipline or specialty interests. In others, students are assigned alphabetically.

While the department head typically determines if the number of advisees assigned to faculty is reasonable, it must be acknowledged that assigning large numbers of students per faculty member is not desirable. As noted earlier, the Center for Academic Excellence will provide advising support for academic departments with large numbers of majors.

**An effective orientation program must be made available to all full- and part-time undergraduate students.**

The University is in compliance.

The University offers an effective orientation program to all full and part time freshmen and transfer students attending ASU for the first time. Two components, Preview ASU and Fish Splash, are held during the summer and the weekend before the fall semester respectively. The third, USTD 1201, is a two-hour credit course offered during the fall and spring semesters.

Preview ASU, coordinated by the Student Life Office, is the University's largest orientation and early registration program. It consists of four two-day sessions and one half-day session throughout the summer and is available for all new freshmen and transfer students to ASU. Preview ASU provides new students with the opportunity to (1) meet with current students; (2) become acquainted with University services, programs, and regulations; (3) be introduced to their major department; (4) receive individual academic advising; and (5) register for their fall classes. In addition, special programs are available for parents to provide information on such issues as academic requirements, academic services, campus regulations, and adjusting to being the parent of a college student.

A full-time University employee administers Preview ASU, hiring approximately thirty to thirty-five students each year to assist with the program. In addition, staff and faculty from almost every ASU department are involved in some facet of Preview ASU. Each academic department selects members of its faculty to serve as academic advisors at each of the five summer Preview ASU sessions. The Office of Admissions and Retention conducts training for these advisors. A record number of students (1221) attended Preview ASU during the summer of 2000. Overall, attendance was up 11.9% from 1999.

Fish Splash, another orientation activity, is held at the beginning of each fall semester and is designed to welcome new freshmen and transfer students to ASU. This program allows these students to develop relationships and skills that will ease their transition from high school to college. This is

accomplished through small group activities and discussions, social interaction, spirit activities, recreation, and workshops dealing with issues such as ASU tradition, values, lifestyle choices, and tips on being a successful student. Over three hundred students participated in Fish Splash 2000.

University Studies 1201 (USTD 1201), offered as a two-hour course every fall and spring semester, introduces students to theories of learning, cognition, and motivation that can help them reason well and solve problems they encounter in the following tasks: selecting a major, developing a career plan, managing their studies, managing their health and lifestyle changes, working through the university system (e.g., housing, financial aid), “connecting” with the campus and community, and forming a relationship with their advisor (or mentor). One of the goals of this course, and an important byproduct, is to improve student retention. The ASU *Academic Master Plan 2000* recommends the “evaluation and, if appropriate, expansion of USTD 1201” (9). Advising has a limited role in USTD 1201, with the instructors explaining the advising process to their students and encouraging them to meet with their advisors. Additionally, helping students to decide on an academic major and to make that critical decision within the first 2 years of their work at ASU is one of the course goals.

While all departments use Preview ASU to provide formal orientation to incoming freshmen and transfer students each summer, some departments also provide independent orientation sessions at the beginning of the fall semester, which are typically made available to all majors, both new and returning, and often provide the following: (1) introductions of faculty and staff, (2) an overview of departmental policies and procedures, (3) an explanation of degree plans, and (4) an opportunity for questions and feedback (*Departmental Inventories*).

**Orientation and advisement programs must be evaluated regularly and used to enhance assistance to students.**

The University is in compliance.

For sixteen consecutive years, ASU has participated in the ACT Student Opinion Survey. In April 2001, the ASU Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment published the 2001 results as well as the ten-year results. In all, twenty-one College Services and forty-two College Environment items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from very satisfied (5), neutral (3), to very dissatisfied (1). Two College Services items—college orientation and academic advising—as well as two College Environment items—availability of advisor and value of information provided by the advisor—are germane to the present discussion. In the latest Survey, ASU students rated college orientation as 4.01, academic advising service as 3.82, availability of their advisors as 3.83, and value of information provided by the advisor as 3.77. Ten-year results were 3.97, 3.85, 3.83, and 3.77 respectively.

The Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment compared ASU means with those from a public college sample that includes responses from 60,000 students in public colleges around

the United States. ASU means for the college orientation program, academic advising services, availability of advisor and value of information provided by the advisor were all significantly above public college ratings of 3.76, 3.76, 3.75 and 3.70 respectively.

The Undergraduate Student Survey also specifically addressed orientation and advising services in four of fifty items. Students were instructed to rate these services using a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree (5), not sure (3), to strongly disagree (1). Listed below are the percent of students who agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:

At ASU:

- 31. I can readily make an appointment to see my advisor. (74.3%)
- 32. Orientation procedures are adequate. (67.4%)
- 33. I receive timely advisement. (72.3%)
- 34. I receive accurate advisement. (68.3%)

These percentages indicate that the majority of students are satisfied with the advising process.

Of the students responding to the Undergraduate Survey of Advising (Declared Majors), 53% indicated they were advised once per semester, while 16% reported receiving advising less than once per semester. Eighty-eight percent reported being advised when they needed it, and 83% said the information provided was accurate. Eighty-eight percent reported that their advisors were available as scheduled, and 79% felt their advisors cared about them. In general, the students felt they benefited from advising.

Students completing the Undergraduate Survey of Advising (Undeclared Majors) were asked to comment on the frequency with which they were advised in the last year. Seventy-one percent reported being advised once a semester, 24% reported being advised less than once a semester, and 5% reported being advised more than once a semester. Students were also asked to comment on the general frequency of advising during their enrollment at ASU. Sixty percent reported being advised once a semester, 33% reported being advised less than once a semester, and 7% reported being advised more than once a semester. Regarding the benefit derived from advising, 63% of the students responded either “a lot” (37%) or “very much” (26%), 30% responded “a little bit”, and 7% responded either “not very much” or “not at all.”

During fall 1995, ASU contracted with the Noel-Levitz Center to conduct a student retention analysis. A major aspect of this study involved administering the *Student Satisfaction Inventory* (SSI) to 4,423 ASU students. One scale on the SSI addresses the effectiveness of academic advising, and this scale consists of five items. ASU student satisfaction with academic advising was equivalent to a national group mean (based on 20,711 student records) on three of the five scale items and was significantly higher than the national group mean on two of the five items. Of the twelve areas measured by the

SSI, ASU students listed academic advising as third in importance and second in degree of satisfaction.

Evaluation also occurs regularly for USTD 1201, one of the three orientation components made available to all undergraduate students, by students and faculty members who teach the course. The Director has also analyzed the results of the IDEA course evaluation form for USTD 1201 when administered in fall 1999 and fall 2000.

With regard to the IDEA criterion of “Progress on Relevant (Essential and Important) Objectives,” 87% of the USTD 1201 students rated USTD 1201 as average or above average in meeting this objective in fall 1999. In fall 2000, 100% of the students rated the course as average or above average in meeting this objective. With regard to the criterion of “Improved Student Attitude,” 53% of the students rated the course as average or above average in meeting this objective in 1999, while 59% of the students rated the course as average or above average in meeting this objective in 2000.

With regard to the IDEA survey criterion of “Overall Excellence of Teacher,” 67% of the USTD 1201 students rated their instructor as average or above average in fall 1999, while 82% of the students rated their instructor as average or above average in fall 2000. With regard to the criterion of “Overall Excellence of Course,” 67% of the students rated the course as average or above average in 1999, while 82% of the students rated the course as average or above average in 2000. The Director has also met with the USTD faculty on a regular basis to consider their recommendations for course modifications. As a direct result of faculty and student feedback, the textbook used in USTD 1201 has been changed, and the attendance policy has been modified. The course now meets two hours per week rather than one hour, and a required novel has been added to the curriculum. The Director and the USTD faculty have recommended keeping USTD as a course to aid incoming freshmen students while they make the transition to university-level work.

Additionally, USTD 1201 is now on the Institutional Effectiveness list and completes an annual evaluation form. Assessment results for 2000-2001 indicate that students completing USTD 1201 reported that the course met its stated goals. Of the 17 sections of the class, three reported “high” in response to the IDEA survey criterion of “progress regarding relevant course objectives,” with eight sections reporting “high/average,” and six sections reporting “average.” Because one of the goals of USTD 1201 is to help students decide on an academic major, assessment objectives include monitoring the number of “undeclared” students who complete the course with a C and declare a major within the first two years at ASU. The 2000-2001 data indicate that of 62 students who enrolled in the course as “undeclared” during the fall semester, 20 (32%) had declared a major by the fall advising deadline, thus enrolling in their spring semester with a major declared. Additionally, of 72 students who enrolled in fall 1999 as “undeclared” and who made a C in the course, 53 (74%) had declared a major within one year of completing the course.

Preview ASU, the largest of the three orientation components, is also evaluated regularly. The ASU Office of Admissions and Retention conducts four Undergraduate Advisor Training Sessions before Preview ASU, and the faculty and staff attending these sessions are provided with an “Advisor’s Notebook” to be used during the Preview ASU advising session.

Participating faculty and staff members are also given the opportunity to evaluate the Undergraduate Advisor Training Session and the actual advising program. Of the 97 faculty and staff members who completed the summer 2001 Academic Advisor Evaluation, 93 (96%) rated the contents of the “Advisor’s Notebook” as excellent or good, 66 (68%) rated the training session as excellent or good, and 90 (93%) rated the student advising session as excellent or good. Before each Preview ASU orientation program, staff members in the Office of Admissions and Retention meet to review the recommendations from these evaluations and discuss any changes that need to be made to existing procedures.

A new student evaluation form that focuses more attention on the academic advising component of Preview ASU was administered during each of the 2001 sessions. According to the Preview ASU 2001 Student Life Executive Summary, data “show that a vast majority of participants were very satisfied with their Preview ASU experiences” as indicated by the high percentages in the “Extremely Satisfied” category. “The only areas about which students were less enthusiastic were Availability of Courses and Availability of Class Times. For these two items, means (3.31 and 3.38 respectively on a 4.0 scale) and percents of responses of “Somewhat Satisfied” and “Extremely Satisfied” (85% and 87% respectively), though lower than the other items, were still very respectable.”

Additionally, the Office of Admissions and Retention distributed a survey during early registration for spring 2001 to all Academic Year Provisional (AYP) students enrolled during the fall 2000 semester. Of the 78% who attended Preview ASU during summer 2000, 97% rated the advising they received as either “Excellent” (65%) or “Good” (32%) (Academic Year Provisional Survey).

Fish Splash, the third component of University’s orientation program, also undergoes regular evaluation. In fall 2000, USTD 1201 instructors received evaluation forms to distribute to students in their class who had attended Fish Splash 2000. Eighty-six per cent of the students gave Fish Splash an overall rating of “Beneficial” (44%) or “Very Beneficial” (42%). In addition, 88% of the students indicated they would recommend Fish Splash to incoming students. Similar results occurred in 1999. Staff members in the Office of Student Life also meet after the conclusion of Fish Splash activities to identify strengths and weaknesses and to recommend changes for the following year’s event.

### **Section 4.2.5: Recommendations and Suggestions**

Because the University complies with all of the requirements for Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students, the Self-Study Steering Committee makes no recommendations. The Committee does, however, offer the following suggestions:

1. Establish a point, perhaps based on number of credit hours completed, by which all students must choose a major and apply for a formal degree plan.
2. Provide advising for all students by faculty, including those admitted as Academic Year Provisional or Summer Provisional.
3. Centralize and standardize the system of advising across all academic departments.
4. Use the Center for Academic Excellence as recommended in the *Academic Master Plan 2000* to help manage student advising, counseling, and retention with special attention to at risk students; to continue the refinement of pre-enrollment advising programs; and to provide orientation programs for all registration periods. Such activities should take place with active, consistent faculty participation.
5. Require all new students to participate in a formal orientation program.

### **Findings**

#### Strengths

1. Admission policies are clearly stated, consistently administered, and widely published.
2. ASU has in place an effective, carefully designed, developmental program, complemented by non-course-based components, support services, and diagnostic testing.
3. ASU has in place an orderly sequence of courses leading to the baccalaureate degrees as well as to the associate degree. This sequence is determined by a well-defined process and is clearly published.
4. The University's *2001-2003 Bulletin* is an effective tool that serves to assist students in planning the completion of their academic program.
5. The University has a well-defined procedure through which curriculum is developed and reviewed. Faculty, administration, and governing board all participate. The implementation of the Academic Program Review Process also helps ensure that the development and review of the curriculum occurs formally and systematically.
6. A clear and effective process exists for ensuring the transfer of applicable course credit from two-year institutions.
7. The University is seriously committed to its teaching function and supports it financially.
8. Faculty and course evaluation is uniformly administered, and the results are used to improve instruction.
9. ASU offers faculty a variety of formal opportunities that encourage experimentation in innovative teaching methods.

10. The University uses a variety of techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of its instructional programs, and the results are used to improve programs.
11. ASU provides a scholarly and creative learning environment through a variety of programs, research opportunities, and resources.
12. Academic advising is made available to all ASU students.
13. All students must receive a release from their advisor to enroll in classes.
14. The On-Course Automated Degree Plan System and other technological advances have helped to standardize and streamline the advising process.
15. Faculty receive training in the advising process.
16. Advising has consistently received positive evaluations from students over the past ten years.
17. Three separate orientation options are available to all new students, freshmen and transfer, at ASU.
18. Orientation programs have consistently received positive evaluations from students over the past ten years.

#### Weaknesses

1. Although a standing committee for several years, the Admissions Committee was not reactivated until fall 2000.
2. While the *2001-2003 Bulletin* clearly explains the terms major and supporting concentration (minor) by identifying specific requirements for each in sections devoted to individual departments, definitions of these two terms are not provided.
3. A significant percentage of faculty members are unsure or disagree that evaluation occurs for experimentation to improve classroom instruction.
4. While student responses on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) are overall comparable to other Master's I and II institutions, most ASU means are a bit lower numerically and are statistically lower for five items (seven means) in the Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences section, the Reading and Writing section, and the Emphasis on Mental Activities section.
5. Some students are advised by staff members rather than by faculty. This is particularly problematic for students whom the University identifies as at risk.
6. Faculty in some departments are assigned large numbers of students to advise.
7. The current advising system is decentralized with academic departments using different approaches to advising.
8. Not all new students participate in formal orientation programs.

## Appendix A

### The International Education Program

#### Overview

International education programs have been operating at ASU since 1972 with the objective of assisting students “in acquiring an appropriate understanding of and appreciation for the international dimensions of contemporary living as well as knowledge and experience which will enable them to function effectively in an international environment” (2001-2003 *Bulletin*, p. 140). Additionally, ASU is a member of the Texas International Education Consortium (TIEC), a private, non-profit corporation that uses the human resources of thirty-two public universities in Texas to aid educational institutions in other countries, assist members in internationalizing their faculty and student populations, and promote international knowledge and communication. ASU’s Consortium projects will not be discussed here, nor will international education opportunities for graduate students.

In the last decade especially, the opportunities for international education at ASU have been significantly expanded and take two forms: summer study abroad programs and academic year/semester exchange programs.

#### Programs

Since 1990 ASU has offered eleven international education programs involving foreign institutes and universities (see Appendix A—Table 1). Of these, six programs, which are reciprocal in design, are the focus of the University’s international study opportunities for both ASU students and those students from cooperating schools. These are the European Studies Program, German Education Program, German Studies Program, International Studies Program (United Kingdom), Mexican Studies Program, and French Exchange Program. Reciprocal agreements between ASU and the participating foreign institution are on file in the Office of the VPAA and are reviewed annually or periodically.

**Appendix A—Table 1**

**International Education Programs, 1990-2001**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Participating Foreign University</b>	<b>Type of Program</b>	<b>Program Cycle</b>	<b>Status</b>
UAL Cooperative Student Summer Exchange Program	Universidad Autonoma De La Laguna, Mexico (ITESM)	Cooperative Summer Exchange		Discontinued 1996
Greek Education Program	University of Rhodes; University of the Aegean	Summer Study Abroad	Periodic	1990; 1992; 2001
Banking and Business Student Exchange	School of Banking and Business, Germany	Summer Study Abroad		Discontinued 1993
European Studies Program	University of Lüneburg, Germany	Reciprocal Exchange	Annual	Active
French Exchange Program	Université de Valenciennes	Reciprocal Exchange	Annual	Active
German Education Program	University of Lüneburg, Germany	Reciprocal Exchange	Biannual	Active
German Studies Program	University of Hannover, Germany	Reciprocal Exchange	Annual	Active
International Studies Program (UK)	1) Sheffield-Hallam University, England 2) Heriot-Watt University, Scotland	1) Summer Study Abroad 2) Reciprocal Exchange	Annual	1) Discontinued 2) Active
Mexican Studies Program	ITESM	Reciprocal Exchange	Annual	Active
Summer Student Exchange Program	ITESM	Summer Study Abroad		Revised into Mexican Studies Program
UAL Mexican Studies Program	Universidad Autonoma De La Laguna, Mexico	Reciprocal Exchange		Discontinued

Under the overseas summer study programs in Europe and Scotland, students in good standing, a recommended GPA of 2.5, enroll for 6 sch of resident credit. The courses are taught by regular ASU faculty members and are generally ones in the ASU curriculum, including special topics courses either in the faculty members' disciplines or university studies special topics courses. Language

credit, however, is not offered for these courses. Those courses offered in these programs must conform to the contact hour and academic quality standards expected of on-campus ASU courses.

Typically, students engage in formal classroom activities on campus both before and after the travel component. While overseas, students continue their study supplemented by briefings, seminars, lectures, workshops, and field experiences provided by the ASU faculty member teaching the course and representative faculty and staff from the host institution.

The Mexican Studies Program, which has a summer component, differs significantly from the overseas programs described above except in the requirements for student eligibility. In this program, faculty at ITESM teach language classes for which ASU students may earn 6 sch of transfer credit for intermediate and, occasionally, advanced Spanish. Additionally, the host university arranges cultural city tours to supplement students' classroom activities. An ASU faculty representative accompanies the students to assist the Coordinator at ITESM and students as needed.

#### Oversight

Because of the size and complexity of ASU's international education program, the University has in place a process for the planning, supervision, and evaluation of the various components that comprise the program. The International Education Committee, chaired by the Dean of the College of Liberal and Fine Arts, acts in a general advisory capacity for all international programs and educational experiences. Faculty members and student representatives who comprise this Committee consider all program proposals and activities and recommend appropriate ones to the VPAA, who, after review, submits supportable ones to the President. All proposals and activities are subject to Presidential approval. Proposed programs, whether summer study abroad or reciprocal exchanges, also require the approval of the Board of Regents and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), which must review and approve course offerings in order for ASU to receive formula funding.

Effective the 2000-2001 academic year, the University also established the position of Coordinator of International Studies with a one-course load reduction in the fall and spring semesters for this assignment. The Coordinator works with the Chair of the International Education Committee and the International Student Advisor to continue the development of the University's international education program through promoting participation in the study abroad and exchange programs and assisting directors in planning and implementing their programs. The Coordinator also represents the University at conferences and in meetings with international education representatives and works with the Dean of the College of Liberal and Fine Arts to plan on-campus meetings and events.

The *International Education Program Manual* (revised August 2001), issued by the Office of the Dean, College of Liberal and Fine Arts, assists faculty in planning and directing international education programs by delineating the process for developing and implementing a program as well as

identifying relevant policies and responsibilities. Additionally, the *Manual* contains an extensive appendix of required forms and a summary of programs offered by the University since 1990.

### Financial Support

To offset costs of international study and travel, financial assistance is available to students. While the University is able to offer affordable programs with those institutions participating in a reciprocal exchange, independent programs have been less successful. These programs are not beneficiaries of reduced or waived fees for room and board, and students are responsible for the expenses of faculty directors, excluding salaries.

Students participating in reciprocal exchange programs enroll and pay for courses at ASU that are designated, for example, as EXCH 4361. This policy allows students to remain on the University's rolls thus qualifying them to receive federal financial aid and scholarships. For summer study abroad and academic year/semester programs with foreign institutions participating in a reciprocal exchange agreement with the University, the foreign host institution waives all tuition and fees for ASU students and generally provides room and board at reduced rates or without charge.

Additionally, students participating in any of the international study abroad programs receive an International Education Fee Scholarship. Texas institutions of higher education may collect \$1.00 per student each semester, including summer sessions, to fund international education opportunities with the proviso that the money be used only to assist students at the institutions. Available money is divided equally among those ASU students participating in study abroad international education programs. During the last legislative session, the original act was amended to allow institutions to collect up to \$4.00 per student each semester providing the increase is approved by a student referendum. In October 2001, ASU's Student Senate tabled a proposed increase in the international education fee for subsequent discussion. Should this item be included on a subsequent student ballot, successful passage would mean increased financial assistance available to ASU students participating in the various international programs.

Since 1997, the University's International Trade and Business Education Initiative has received funding from the U. S. Department of Education. As part of this Initiative, Study Abroad Scholarships, ranging from \$250.00 to \$1,000.00 have been awarded to students majoring in business and government or other fields related to international trade.

### Program Evaluation

The University's international education program is evaluated regularly and systematically. As stated in the *International Education Program Manual*, the International Education Committee assesses "each of the programs in terms of its effectiveness in meeting program objectives and levels of

student satisfaction” (23) through faculty and student evaluations of each program as well as through the University’s annual Institutional Effectiveness System.

Faculty directors conduct an evaluation of major components at or near the end of each program that reflects student reaction. Students not only rate elements of the program, but also “write about the importance of the experience for them in broader educational terms” (*International Education Program Manual*, p. 23). Additionally, faculty directors prepare an inclusive narrative evaluation at the conclusion of their respective programs.

Complementing the program evaluations provided by faculty and students is the broader assessment designed to assess the international education program at the University level with the objective of ensuring continuing opportunities for students to participate in ASU-sponsored international studies programs. While the desired minimum student body participation annually in these programs has declined slightly during 1999-2001, a marketing plan has been implemented to better acquaint ASU students with the various international education programs. The proposed plan, an aggressive campaign to disseminate information and to attract participants, includes brochures, letters to Carr Scholarship recipients, participation in various recruiting activities, and announcements in the *RamPage* and on Ram Radio. Those students who participate in the programs agree that they are well planned and directed with 100% expressing satisfaction with the programs as a positive educational and personal experience according to the assessment results for 1999-2000.

### **Appendix A: Recommendations and Suggestions**

The Self-Study Steering Committee makes no recommendations regarding the University’s international education program but does offer the following suggestions:

1. Explore ways to increase financial aid and scholarship awards for students who participate in international study programs.
2. Continue marketing study abroad programs to disseminate information and to attract participants.

### **Findings**

#### Strengths

1. During the past decade, ASU has significantly expanded its international education program to include six active reciprocal exchange programs with foreign institutes and universities in Europe and Mexico.
2. Oversight of the various programs is extensive and systematic. Faculty and student representation on the International Education Committee ensure University-wide participation in planning, supervising, and evaluating program components while the

- Coordinator of International Studies and Dean of the College of Liberal and Fine Arts assume administrative responsibility for assisting program directors, promoting program participation, and representing the University as international education representatives.
3. The *International Education Program Manual*, revised August 2001, provides faculty members an effective guide for developing and implementing an international studies program including the program proposal, recruitment, travel, relevant policies, responsibilities, and required documentation.
  4. The international education program is evaluated regularly and systematically through student participants, faculty directors, and University-wide assessment.
  5. Students who participate indicate an extremely high rate of satisfaction with the programs as a positive educational and personal experience.

#### Weaknesses

1. Although financial assistance is available to students who wish to study abroad, costs are often prohibitive for independent programs and, to a lesser extent, for reciprocal exchange programs whose students are ineligible for the University's International Trade and Business Education Initiative Study Abroad Scholarships.
2. Since 1997, student participation in international study programs has not grown significantly.

## **Appendix B**

### **Goodfellow Air Force Base (GAFB) Education Program**

#### History

The Goodfellow Air Force Base educational program is coordinated by the Division of Continuing Studies (DCS). The DCS serves as a liaison between the University and active duty-military personnel (and others) stationed at GAFB. Academic administration is under the supervision of the Dean of the College of Business and Professional Studies, who reports directly to the VPAA.

In keeping with the University's mission, Angelo State University (ASU) has taught classes at Goodfellow Air Force Base (GAFB) since 1974, generally at the request of Goodfellow's Education Service Officer (ESO). Within the confines of a regular University semester, this limited program was taught on either an eight-week or sixteen-week term for the convenience of base personnel. There were occasional six-week formats which coincided with the then established University summer term. During these early days, no on-base degree program was provided because it had not been requested.

In early 1989, GAFB requested that ASU provide one or two on-base degree programs. On July 14, 1989, the University obtained approval from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

(THECB) to provide two on-base degree programs—a B.B.A. in Management and a B.A. in Psychology. This arrangement between the two was a pilot program in Texas, and all similar requests from other institutions were deferred until a 1993 review was completed. In 1995 ASU began offering a third degree at GAFB, the Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.). It is important to note that the THECB considers ASU's course offerings at GAFB on-campus offerings, even though GAFB is less than five miles from the campus. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools considers it to be an off-campus program.

### GAFB Admission

GAFB personnel may be admitted as non-degree seeking or degree seeking students. Those seeking a degree must follow all of the requirements of regularly enrolled ASU students. Like other students, military personnel may be awarded placement credit through the College Level Examination Program (CLEP). Military personnel may also be awarded credit for work completed through the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) Program, Community College of the Air Force, and U.S. Air Force Institute (USAFI). The University awards credit for acceptable CLEP scores posted on DANTES transcripts.

Because of the nature of the GAFB's missions (security, intelligence, and fire training), some of which requires intensive language instruction, many of the students desire to transfer their language training. The University will award credit for language training if the credit appears on a transcript from an accredited institution or if the student presents an official transcript from the Defense Language Institute. The amount of college credit awarded is based on the number of semester credit hours posted on the official college transcript or, in the case of a DLI transcript, on the number of sch recommended by the American Council of Education through the publication *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Forces* (a copy is on file in the Office of Transfer Student Services).

### GAFB Completion Requirements

A student who is within twenty-nine sch of graduating is subject to the same requirements for graduation as are all other students. Military students can take advantage of the military program Operation Boot Strap to obtain leave from their regular duties when they are within a year of graduation. They then become full-time students, relatively free of military obligations. The ASU ROTC program also assists students as they near graduation.

### GAFB Curriculum

The curriculum offered on base is determined by the ASU academic department heads in consultation with their deans, the VPAA, the Director of the Division of Continuing Studies, and the GAFB Education Services Officer. All classes are regularly offered ASU academic classes, and no "special"

classes are taught. Classes are currently offered in eight and sixteen week formats; the number of contact hours in each course is the equivalent of a regular fifteen-week course offered on campus—that is, forty-five classroom contact hours. The University offers approximately ten classes each long semester and one or two during the first summer term. Generally speaking, basic or “core” classes are taught frequently, with upper level courses offered only in the business and psychology areas.

### GAFB Instruction

Regular members of the ASU faculty generally teach all courses at GAFB as part of their normal twelve-hour teaching load, but occasionally a department might hire an adjunct faculty member as needed. Expectations for base personnel are the same as for those students regularly attending classes on the ASU campus. Syllabi and textbooks are also the same. In other words, no quality compromises are made to adjust to the location or the format of the GAFB classes. Because a number of academic departments participate in the GAFB program, assessment of instruction is routinely conducted in each course at the end of semesters.

### Facilities

There are seven standard classrooms in the GAFB Education Services Center. The remaining rooms are computer labs or offices. The capacity of each classroom ranges from sixteen to forty-eight; most of the rooms will accommodate thirty-five students. Classroom furniture consists of regular student desks and chairs. Two of the classrooms are set up to receive satellite transmissions from the Air Force Technology Network (AFIT).

There are thirty-one computers owned by Howard College set up among three classrooms. These could be available to ASU students if a special arrangement were developed between ASU and Howard College. Nevertheless, all GAFB students enrolled in ASU classes have full access to the library, computer labs, and all other facilities on the ASU campus. Audio-visual equipment is available in each classroom. Equipment includes an overhead projector and a computer capable of showing a PowerPoint presentation on a television located in each classroom.

### Access

Access to the base is occasionally difficult, depending on the alert level. While every attempt is made to ensure easy access, this isn't always the case. All non-military personnel entering the base must produce a valid driver's license, proof of liability, and a current auto registration. A car pass is then issued. No access is allowed without meeting these requirements. Access may also be denied when the base goes to a higher alert status. Thus, entrance to, and occasionally departure from, the base may be restricted. Because San Angelo lacks an effective mass transit system that might enable students and faculty without vehicles to get to the base, there are necessarily some limitations on those who might wish to enroll in GAFB classes.

The Current Situation

The comfortable arrangement ASU has had with GAFB has been eroding lately. ASU is no longer the primary provider of instruction. Three other institutions—Southern Illinois University, Park College, and Howard College—offer classes or degree programs, often with adjunct faculty in the classroom rather than regular faculty from each institution. At least one other institution (Excelsior College, formerly Regents College) is interested in serving GAFB. Each of these institutions draws students away from ASU by offering, in some instances, experiential credit, something ASU does not do. Where ASU once commanded the largest number of students enrolled in its programs, now it is probably fourth after the others. There seem to be problems with staff at GAFB, and with the intense competition for students from the other institutions with on-base courses, ASU’s programs may not always be explained clearly by base personnel. Thus there may be a declining interest in ASU’s degree offerings provided on base among military personnel stationed at GAFB. Apparently, ASU is no longer providing educational services to the population it intended to serve when the program began. The University needs to determine if this program is still cost effective and worth the enormous resources involved in continuing it.

Tables 1 and 2 below illustrate the current difficulties with the GAFB program. These numbers show quite distinctly that very few of regularly enrolled students in courses at the base come from the active military population at Goodfellow, and from occasional figures that have been reported in the recent past, these numbers are typical.

**Appendix B—Table 1**

**Schedule of Courses, Fall, 2000**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>PhD</b>	<b>Master</b>	<b>Total Enrolled</b>	<b>Total Withdrew</b>	<b>Active Military</b>	<b>% Active Military</b>
16 WK	ACC	2301		X	24	10	1	4
16 WK	ECO	2301	X		26	3		
16 WK	MIS	3343	X		20	4		
16 WK	PSY	3305	X		9	0		
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	ENG	1301	X		10	0		
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	HIST	1301	X		24	2	2	8
2 <sup>nd</sup> 8 WK	HIST	1302	X		21	1		
2 <sup>nd</sup> 8 WK	COMM	2301		X	10	0		

Data supplied by Coordinator of the Division of Continuing Studies.

**Appendix B—Table 2**

**Schedule of Courses, Spring, 2001**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>PhD</b>	<b>Master</b>	<b>Total Enrolled</b>	<b>Total Withdrew</b>	<b>Active Military</b>	<b>% Active Military</b>
16 WK	ACC	2302		X	47	7	1	2
16 WK	ECO	2302	X		19	1	1	5
16 WK	MKT	3322		X	41	1		
16 WK	PSY	4305	X		30	1	2	6
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	COMM	2301		X	30	2	4	13
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	ENG	2331	X		8	0	0	0
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	GOVT	2301	X		43	4	1	2
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 WK	MATH	1302		X	16	0	4	25

Data supplied by Coordinator of the Division of Continuing Studies.

**Appendix B: Recommendations and Suggestions**

The Self-study Steering Committee makes no recommendations regarding the Goodfellow Air Force Base education program but does offer the following suggestions:

1. The University should conduct a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the GAFB program. This assessment would include a cost benefit analysis of the program.
2. All individual academic departments that have not done so thus far should assess their participation in the GAFB program and should focus on staffing difficulties, student participation, cost, and class integrity. Each department should consider whether an eight-week format is a satisfactory way to teach the department's classes.
3. The University should experiment with eight-week formatted classes on campus in selected academic areas to determine whether students choose GAFB courses on the basis of this format. If so, courses should be offered in this format on campus as well.

**Findings**

Strengths

1. The ASU/GAFB program is an important recruiting and public relation tool.
2. ASU liaisons spend three or four hours a day on base to assist military personnel with TASP, CLEP, and DANTES information; answer questions; help solve problem; and in general stay in close contact with everyone involved with the base program. Their presence demonstrates the University's commitment to providing quality instruction at Goodfellow Air Force Base.
3. Some regularly enrolled ASU students prefer the eight-week class format provided at GAFB.

### Weaknesses

1. The GAFB program has never had a top to bottom assessment since it began. While instruction is routinely assessed by the academic departments teaching classes at the base, the program as a whole has not been.
2. Few military personnel enroll in GAFB classes. ASU students routinely take evening classes at GAFB because they are listed in the regular University schedule of classes, thus helping keep the GAFB program viable.

## Section IV - Undergraduate Program Compliance Grid

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<b>Section 4.1 General Requirements of the Educational Program</b>		
<i>All aspects of the educational program <b>must</b> be clearly related to the purpose of the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Institutional Effectiveness Reports</a></li> </ul>
<i>The institution <b>must</b> provide a competent faculty, adequate library/learning resources, and appropriate computer resources, instructional materials/equipment and physical facilities.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Self-Study Report</i>, Sections <a href="#">4.8</a>, <a href="#">5.1</a>, <a href="#">5.2</a>, <a href="#">5.3</a>, and <a href="#">6.4</a></li> </ul>
<i>The student enrollment and financial resources of an institution <b>must</b> be sufficient to support an effective educational program.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Self-Study Report</i>, Section <a href="#">6.3</a></li> </ul>
<i>In addition, the institution <b>must</b> ensure appropriate levels of student achievement and equivalent quality of programs regardless of method of instruction or location of program.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Self-Study Report</i>, Sections <a href="#">4.5</a> and <a href="#">4.2 (Appendix B)</a></li> </ul>
<b>4.2 Undergraduate Program</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Undergraduate Admission</b>		
<i>General admission policies <b>must</b> be established by the governing board on recommendation of the administration. The board is <b>responsible</b> for deciding the size and character of the student body. Implementation of specific admission policies, however, is the <b>responsibility</b> of the administration and faculty of the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Rules and Regulations of the Texas State University System Board of Regents (VI-1)</a></li> <li>• <i>Summary of Institutional Data Planning Resource Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>Faculty-Staff Handbook (I-2, II-1)</i></li> </ul>
<i>The unit responsible for administering the policies <b>must</b> be clearly identified.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook, Angelo State University Administrative Organization, p. [ix].</a></li> </ul>
<i>In those institutions in which various subdivisions maintain separate admission requirements, there <b>must</b> be institution-wide coordination of all admission policies and procedures.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 348, 322-323, 332-333)</a></li> </ul>
<i>Admission policies <b>must</b> be consistent with the educational purposes of the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (p. 46)</a></li> </ul>
<i>They <b>must</b> include qualitative and quantitative requirements that identify students who demonstrate reasonable potential for success at the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 47-52)</a></li> </ul>

<b>Must Statement</b>	<b>Compliance Status</b>	<b>Documentation</b>
<i>An institution admitting students with deficiencies in their preparation for collegiate study <b>must</b> offer appropriate developmental or remedial support to assist these students.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ASU Developmental Education Plan, (Spring, 2000)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 130-132, 250, 316)</a></li> </ul>
<i>Each institution <b>must</b> regularly evaluate its admission policies.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Minutes of Admissions Committee (Office of Admissions)</a></li> </ul>
<i>To be admitted to degree programs, applicants <b>must</b> show evidence of high school graduation or other successful experiences which reasonably predict their ability to make satisfactory progress at the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 46-52)</a></li> </ul>
<i>Each institution <b>must</b> assess and justify the appropriateness of experiences offered in lieu of a high school diploma.</i>	N.A.	
<i>Procedures established for implementation of institutional admission policies <b>must</b> be followed in the admission of all students.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 46-52)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The institution <b>must</b> provide evidence that it selects students whose interests and capabilities are consistent with the admission policies.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Admissions Report, ADM012 (Office of Admissions)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (p. 147)</a></li> <li>• GPA Average Report (Office of Admissions)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 8)</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution <b>must</b> clearly define and publish its policy on the admission of transfer students.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 48-49)</a></li> <li>• <i>Guide for Transfer Students</i></li> </ul>
<i>The policy <b>must</b> include the following: the requirement for official transcripts of credits earned from all institutions of higher education previously attended; qualitative and quantitative criteria determining the acceptability of transfer work; criteria regarding the award of advanced standing, whether by credit earned at another institution, by advanced placement examinations, or through experiential learning; and conditions governing admission in good standing, admission on probation, and provisional admission.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 48-49)</a></li> <li>• <i>Guide for Transfer Students</i></li> </ul>
<i>Institutions which award credit based on advanced placement or other examinations; training provided by non-collegiate institutions, such as armed</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 135-140)</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<p><i>forces and service schools; professional certification; or experiential learning <b>must</b> meet the following conditions governing the award of such credit;</i></p> <p><i>1. The amount of credit awarded is clearly stated and is in accord with commonly accepted good practice in higher education.</i></p>		
<p><i>2. Credit is awarded only in areas offered within the current curriculum of the institution, and is appropriately related to the student's educational programs.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 135-140)</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>3. Decisions regarding the awarding of credit and the determination of such credit are made by qualified faculty members at the institution, or according to procedures and standards approved by qualified faculty. The institution demonstrates that assessment procedures verify that the credit awarded is appropriate.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 135-140)</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>In awarding credit for prior experiential learning, the institution <b>must</b></i></p> <p><i>1. award credit only for documented learning which demonstrates achievement of all outcomes for specific courses in an approved degree program;</i></p>	N.A.	
<p><i>2. award credit only to matriculated students, identify such credit on the student's transcript as credit for prior experiential learning and, upon request from another institution, document how such learning was evaluated and the basis on which such credit was awarded;</i></p>	N.A.	
<p><i>3. ensure that credit for prior experiential learning does not duplicate credit already awarded or remaining courses planned for the student's academic program;</i></p>	N.A.	
<p><i>4. adopt, describe in appropriate institutional publications, implement and regularly review policies and procedures for</i></p>	N.A.	

<b>Must Statement</b>	<b>Compliance Status</b>	<b>Documentation</b>
<i>awarding credit for experiential learning; and</i>		
<i>5. clearly describe, and establish the validity of, the evaluation process and criteria for awarding credit for prior experiential learning.</i>	N.A.	
<i>The institution <b>must</b> inform transfer students of the amount of credit which will transfer, preferably prior to their enrollment, but at least prior to the end of the first academic term in which they are enrolled.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Guide for Transfer Students</i></li> </ul>
<i>Coursework transferred or accepted for credit toward an undergraduate degree <b>must</b> represent collegiate coursework relevant to the degree, with course content and level of instruction resulting in student competencies at least equivalent to those of students enrolled in the institution's own undergraduate degree programs.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (p. 53)</a></li> <li>• <i>Transfer Credit Practices of Designated Educational Institutions</i> (Office of Transfer Student Services)</li> <li>• <i>Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services</i> (Office of Transfer Student Services)</li> </ul>
<i>There <b>must</b> be clearly defined policies regarding the academic dismissal, suspension and readmission of students.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 147-148)</a></li> </ul>
<i>Readmission of students dismissed or suspended for academic reasons <b>must</b> be consistent with the academic policies of the institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 147-148)</a></li> </ul>
<b>4.2.2 Undergraduate Completion Requirements</b>		
<i>In each degree program, there <b>must</b> be an appropriate sequence of courses leading to the degree.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Institutional Data Book 2000-2001 (p. 25)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174, 182-360)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Curriculum Change Guidelines, February 2001</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution <b>must</b> publish the requirements for each degree it awards.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174, 182-360)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The requirements <b>must</b> be appropriate to the degree offered and <b>must</b> specify the total credits, the number and distribution of general education credits, the number of credits to be earned in the major or area of concentration, the number of electives, standards for satisfactory progress, and other degree requirements.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174, 182-360)</a></li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 13)</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<i>Undergraduate degree programs <b>must</b> contain a basic core of general education courses. A minimum of 15 semester hours for associate programs and a minimum of 30 semester hours for baccalaureate programs <b>are required</b> for degree completion.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The core <b>must</b> include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 135-140, 153-174)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The institution <b>must</b> demonstrate that its graduates of degree programs are competent in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills and the basic use of computers.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Alumni Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution <b>must</b> clearly define what is meant by a major or an area of concentration and <b>must</b> state the number of credits required for each.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 178-179, 182-360)</a></li> </ul>
<i>An adequate number of hours with appropriate prerequisites <b>must</b> be required in courses above the elementary level.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 182-360)</a></li> </ul>
<i>For degree completion, at least 25 percent of semester credit hours, or the equivalent quarter hours, <b>must</b> be earned through instruction by the institution awarding the degree.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174)</a></li> </ul>
<i>All courses, other than those identified by the institution as developmental/remedial, offered by an institution for credit <b>must</b> be acceptable as requirements or electives applicable to at least one of its own degree or certificate programs or <b>must</b> be clearly identified on transcripts as not applicable to any of the institution's own degree or certificate programs.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174, 182-360)</a></li> </ul>
<b>4.2.3 Undergraduate Curriculum</b>		
<i>Curricula <b>must</b> be directly related and appropriate to the purpose and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates or degrees awarded; to the ability and preparation of the students</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">State Strategic Plan 2001-2005 (p. 6)</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<i>admitted: and to the financial and instructional resources of the institution.</i>		
<i>The institution <b>must</b> have a clearly defined process by which the curriculum is established, reviewed and evaluated.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 13)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-2)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Curriculum Change Guidelines, February 2001</a></li> <li>• Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>
<i>This process <b>must</b> recognize the various roles of the faculty, the administration and the governing board.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Curriculum Change Guidelines, February 2001</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (I-9)</a></li> </ul>
<i>For each major in a degree program, the institution <b>must</b> assign responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (IV-33-34)</a></li> </ul>
<i>At least one full-time faculty member with appropriate credentials, as defined in Section 4.8.2, <b>must</b> have primary teaching assignment in the major.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Summary of Institutional Data, Planning Resource Guide, 1999-2000</i></li> </ul>
<i>The governing board <b>must</b> be responsible for approving the number and types of degrees; the number and nature of departments, divisions, schools or colleges through which the curriculum is administered; and the extent to which the institution should offer distance learning programs.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Rules and Regulations of the Texas State University System Board of Regents (I-1, I-6, III-17-18)</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-2)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The administration and faculty <b>must</b> be responsible for the development of academic programs recommended to the governing board. They <b>are also responsible</b> for implementing and monitoring the general curriculum policy and the academic programs approved by the board.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-2)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Curriculum Change Guidelines, February 2001</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 1)</a></li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> </ul>
<i>Curricula intended to provide basic preparation for students who will subsequently transfer to another institution <b>must</b> be designed to consider the institutions to which these students transfer.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 153-174, 257, 292, 297, 309, 342)</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Two Plus Two Articulation Agreements (Office of the VPAA)</a></li> </ul>
<i>"Inverted," "two plus two" and similar programs <b>must</b> include an adequate amount of advanced coursework in the subject field.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Articulation Agreements (Office of the VPAA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Memoranda of Agreement Pertaining to Dual Degree</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Programs (Office of the VPAA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 291, 343)</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>Institutions which enter into programmatic partnerships with secondary schools which result in the award of college credit, such as technical and dual enrollment programs, <b>must</b> ensure that the credit awarded is at the collegiate level and is in compliance with the Criteria and with Section IV in particular.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Partnership for Award of Dual Course Credit Agreements (Office of the VPAA)</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>Partnerships <b>must</b> be evaluated regularly by the participating institution of higher education.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Dual Credit Early Admission Evaluations (Office of Admissions)</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>The participating institution <b>must</b> assume full responsibility for the academic quality and integrity of partnerships as measured by the Criteria.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Partnership for Award of Dual Course Credit Agreements (Office of the VPAA)</a></li> </ul>
<b>4.2.4 Undergraduate Instruction</b>		
<p><i>Instructional techniques and policies <b>must</b> be in accord with the purpose of the institution and be appropriate to the specific goals of an individual course.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">State Strategic Plan, 2001-2005 (pp. 3, 6)</a></li> <li>• IDEA Form Institutional Summary of Primary and Secondary Instructional Approaches (Office of IPRA)</li> <li>• IDEA Form Institutional Summary of Course Emphases (Office of IPRA)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Undergraduate Student Survey</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>Instruction <b>must</b> be evaluated regularly and the results used to ensure quality instruction.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDEA Forms</li> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (IV-26-28)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Undergraduate Student Survey</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>Students <b>must</b> be provided written information about the goals and requirements of each course, the nature of the course content, and the methods of evaluation to be employed.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-9)</a></li> <li>• Printed Course Syllabi (Departmental Offices)</li> <li>• Electronic Syllabi (Departmental Web Site Links to Individual Instructors at www.angelo.edu)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Undergraduate Student Survey</a></li> </ul>
<p><i>Methods of instruction <b>must</b> be appropriate to the goals of each course and the capabilities of the students.</i></p>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ASU Developmental Education Plan (Spring, 2000) (p. 1)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 13)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">IDEA Form Institutional Summary of Teaching Methods</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">and Styles (Office of IPRA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Undergraduate Student Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>Experimentation with methods to improve instruction <b>must</b> be adequately supported and critically evaluated.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Self-Study Faculty Survey</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty Development Handbook 2000-2001 (p. 8)</a></li> <li>• IDEA Form Institutional Summary, Fall 2000-2001 (Office of IPRA)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Self-Study Faculty Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution <b>must</b> use a variety of means to evaluate student performance.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-9)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Self-Study Faculty Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>The evaluation <b>must</b> reflect concern for quality and properly discern levels of student performance.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty-Staff Handbook (V-9)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">ACT Student Opinion Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution must publish its grading policies, and its grading practices must be consistent with policy.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">2001-2003 Bulletin (pp. 142-144)</a></li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Undergraduate Student Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>The institution <b>must</b> evaluate the effectiveness of its instructional programs by a variety of techniques, which may include the following: use of standardized tests and comprehensive examinations, assessment of the performance of graduates in advanced programs or employment, and sampling of the opinions of former students.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departmental Institutional Effectiveness Reports (Office of IPRA)</li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Executive Summary of the Graduation Survey Results for Academic Year 2001</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Alumni Surveys</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Spring 2001 (Office of IPRA)</a></li> </ul>
<i>Courses offered in non-traditional formats, e.g., concentrated or abbreviated time periods, <b>must</b> be designed to ensure an opportunity for preparation, reflection and analysis concerning the subject matter.</i>	N.A.	
<i>The institution <b>must</b> demonstrate that students completing these programs or courses have acquired equivalent levels of knowledge and competencies to those acquired in traditional formats.</i>	N.A.	
<i>Effective instruction depends largely upon the maintenance of an environment conducive to study and learning. Therefore, an institution of higher education <b>must</b> provide for its students a learning environment in which scholarly and creative achievement is encouraged.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ACT Student Opinion Survey (Office of IPRA)</a></li> </ul>

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<i>In certain professional, vocational and technical programs (for example, allied health programs), clinical and other affiliations with outside agencies may be necessary. In all such cases, learning experiences for which credit is awarded <b>must</b> be under the ultimate control and supervision of the educational institution.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Agreements for Use of Clinical Facilities with the Department of Nursing (Office of VPAA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Preceptor Handbook (p. 8) (Department of Nursing)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Student Teaching Handbook (School of Education)</a></li> </ul>
<i>The institution <b>must</b> demonstrate that an effective relationship exists between curricular content and current practices in the field of specialization.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ACT Student Opinion Survey (Office of IPRA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Alumni Survey</a></li> </ul>
<i>An institution must demonstrate that program length, clock hours or credit hours, and tuition and fee charges are appropriate for the degrees and credentials it offers.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Tuition and Fee Schedule” (Fiscal Office)</li> </ul>
<b>4.2.5 Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students</b>		
<i>Each institution <b>must</b> conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty Staff Handbook (V-16)</a></li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> </ul>
<i>An institution <b>must</b> ensure that the number of advisees assigned to faculty or professional staff is reasonable.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 9)</a></li> </ul>
<i>An effective orientation program <b>must</b> be made available to all full- and part-time undergraduate students.</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Academic Master Plan 2000 (p. 9)</a></li> <li>• <i>Departmental Inventories</i></li> </ul>
<i>Orientation and advisement programs <b>must</b> be evaluated regularly and used to enhance assistance to students.</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ACT Student Opinion Survey (Office of IPRA)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Survey of Undergraduate Students</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Survey of Advising (Declared Majors)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Survey of Advising (Undeclared Majors)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Student Satisfaction Inventory</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">IDEA Forms for USTD 1201</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">2001 Academic Advisor Evaluation (Office of Admissions)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Preview ASU 2001 Student Life Executive Summary (Office of Student Life)</a></li> <li>• Academic Year Provisional Survey (Office of Admissions)</li> <li>• Fish Splash Student Evaluation Results (Office of Student Life)</li> </ul>