



**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges**

REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE

(Off-Site and On-Site Reaffirmation Committees)

Statement Regarding the Report

The Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is responsible for making the final determination on reaffirmation of accreditation based on the findings contained in this committee report, the institution's response to issues contained in the report, other assessments relevant to the review, and application of the Commission's policies and procedures. Final interpretation of the Principles of Accreditation and final action on the accreditation status of the institution rest with SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

Name of the Institution: Angelo State University
San Angelo, Texas

Date of the Review: March 19-21, 2013

COC Staff Member: Dr. Mark. V. Smith

Chair of the Committee: Dr. Rebecca I. Porterfield
Associate Dean Cameron School of Business
Director of Assessment and International Programs
University of North Carolina – Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina

Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

This Report of the Reaffirmation Committees combines the judgments of the Off-Site and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committees. The Off-Site Review occurred November 6-7, 2012 and identified 14 questions of compliance (two Core Requirements and 12 Comprehensive Standards). The institution's Focused Report addressing each of these issues was submitted with Angelo State University's Quality Enhancement Plan (*CONNECT!*). The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee Visit occurred March 19-21, 2013. The report will be forwarded to the institution for a formal response. The report and the institution's response are forwarded to the Commission's Board of Trustees for action on reaffirmation of accreditation.

Angelo State University (ASU) is located in San Angelo, Texas (population approximately 93,000) and is a member of the Texas Tech University System having joined in September 2007. ASU was founded by local citizens as San Angelo Junior College in 1928. Since that time, the college transitioned to a four year college and then to its current SACSCOC Level V classification. Initial SACSCOC accreditation was achieved in 1936. In addition, the institution moved from a downtown location to its current location in the College Hills area of San Angelo.

ASU is located on 268 acres of land and is home to nearly 7,000 students who have the opportunity to pursue over 100 majors and concentrations through 45 undergraduate degrees, 22 masters programs and one doctoral program. Two hundred and forty six fulltime and 86 part-time faculty support the educational mission with a faculty to student ratio of 20:1. ASU has been designated a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) by the U.S. Department of Education. The corresponding HSI grant funds programs for the entire campus community. At the time of the site visit, ASU had an approximate enrollment of 7,000 students and was under the leadership of President Brian May, who was inaugurated as the tenth president of the institution in November, 2012.

ASU has a number of distinguishing features, including the Robert G. and Nona K. Carr Foundation, funded by mineral and royalty interests from oil-producing properties in 16 West Texas counties established to provide scholarships for "needy and worthy" students. The first scholarships were awarded in 1981. Today the fund is valued at more than \$100 million and in 2012 nearly \$70,000 in scholarships were awarded.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was hosted in a very collegial and professional manner characterized by both integrity and "Texas style" hospitality. All conditions necessary for a successful site visit were provided.

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

Sections A thru E to be completed by the Off-Site Review Committee and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. An asterisk before the standard indicates that it will be reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee even if the off-site review determines compliance.

A. Assessment of Compliance with Section 1: The Principle of Integrity

1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters. **(Integrity)**

Both the Off-Site and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committees found that the institution operates with integrity in all matters.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

2.1 The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies. **(Degree-granting Authority)**

The institution documented its authority to grant baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degrees by providing appropriate references from the Texas Education Code, minutes of meetings of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System (TTUS), and the inventory of programs authorized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

2.2 The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

A military institution authorized and operated by the federal government to award degrees has a public board on which both the presiding officer and a majority of the other members are neither civilian employees of the military nor active/retired military. The board has broad and significant influence upon the institution's programs and operations, plays an active role in policy-making, and ensures that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from the board except as specified by the authorizing legislation. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting board members are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. **(Governing Board)**

As a member institution of the Texas Tech University System (TTUS), Angelo State University is governed by the Texas Tech University System Board of

Regents. The institution documented that the Board is comprised of nine members appointed by the Governor of Texas to staggered six-year terms and one student member appointed by the Governor for a one-year term. The statutory authority and responsibility of the Board was documented, as were the preclusion of conflict of interest and the requirement of the approval of a majority of the Board to do business.

- 2.3** The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board. (*See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.3: Documenting an Alternate Approach."*) **(Chief Executive Officer)**

The chief executive officer of Angelo State University is the President who is directly responsible to the Chancellor of the TTUS. This was documented by appropriate references to the TTUS Board of Regents' rules and with the detailed job description of the responsibilities of the President of Angelo State University. The President of Angelo State University is not a member of the governing board.

- 2.4** The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service. **(Institutional Mission)**

Angelo State University's mission statement is specific to the institution and includes the requisite components. Further, the institution documented the publication of the mission statement in both electronic and printed form. The statement has been approved by the TTUS Board of Regents and the Texas Higher Education Commission Board (THECB).

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

The institution clearly defined and provided convincing documentation of its institutional effectiveness processes which include strategic planning, organizational planning, and systematic and ongoing evaluation which are linked to resource distribution and budget allocation. In 2009 the institution implemented use by all units of software called Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) which collects data in planning, assessment and budgeting. The institution provided sufficient examples to demonstrate the use of the analysis of results to make improvements (e.g., Centennial Master Plan 2028, Campus Master Plan and Progress, Unit-Level Strategic Plans). In addition, the institution clearly defined and provided documentation of how the institution integrates accountability reports for the TTU System and THECB.

- 2.6** The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs. **(Continuous Operation)**

The institution opened in 1928 as San Angelo College, a two-year institution, and was renamed Angelo State College in 1965 when it began offering baccalaureate degrees. In 2007, the institution became Angelo State University as part of the Texas Tech University System. The university has been in continuous operation since 1928. In Fall 2011, Angelo State enrolled over 6,200 undergraduate students and more than 800 graduate students.

- 2.7.1** The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit. **(Program Length)**

The institution offers one Associate degree which is 60 semester hours in length and is being phased out. The institution's bachelor's degrees range in program length from 120 semester hours to 128 hours. The institution's masters programs, equal or exceed 30 semester hours. The University Catalog confirms the length of these programs.

- 2.7.2** The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. **(Program Content)**

ASU degree programs demonstrate course content, sequencing and linkages among program components appropriate to higher education. The design and development of the curriculum rests with the faculty. Criteria for new baccalaureate and master's degree programs mandate that any new program must be consistent with the existing role and mission of the institution. For all degrees offered, detailed plans of study, program credit hour numbers, and relevant policies and procedures for applicants and students are published in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. There is a well-defined process for review of curricular changes and new program approval, consistent with the institution's mission and policies.

- *2.7.3** In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required

number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. **(General Education)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that ASU's Core Curriculum of 44 semester credit hours constitutes between 34-37 percent of the total semester credit hours required for a bachelor's degree. Components of the core curriculum require courses in the following areas: communication, mathematics, natural sciences, humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences and an institutionally designated area. A detailed list of common core requirements and the courses that meet the requirements is published in multiple places including the undergraduate catalog and is easily accessible and understandable to students. The University Core Curriculum is consistent with the articulated University Undergraduate Learning Goals. Program-specific requirements are published under specific programs in the undergraduate catalog.

Successful completion of the University Core Curriculum is required for meeting graduation requirements for all programs which is monitored through academic advising and the online degree evaluation system, RamPort. ASU's Core Curriculum exceeds the common core curriculum standards required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board as reviewed in the 2012-13 online catalog and as evidenced in examples of online transcripts. The ASU Core Curriculum incorporates breadth of knowledge which does not focus on skills, techniques, and procedures related to the student's major or intended profession. After review of the catalog, transcripts, and other relevant documents, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 2.7.4** The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. (See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach.") **(Course work for Degrees)**

Angelo State University (ASU) provides instruction for all course work required for all degree programs at each level at which it awards degrees. Program requirements are published in the ASU Undergraduate Catalog 2011–2012 and the ASU Graduate Catalog 2011–2012. ASU does not offer any academic programs or courses through consorial relationships or contractual agreements. Control and quality assurance is maintained through policies and procedures governing the acceptance of academic credit from other institutions.

- *2.8** The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. **(Faculty)**

The institution employs 272 full-time faculty, defined as faculty who are expected to teach 12 or more credit hours per semester. This represents 80% of all faculty members. Approximately one-half of ASU's undergraduate degree programs and all of its stand-alone minors are taught solely by full-time faculty. The minimum percentages of credit hours taught by full-time faculty were in the BBA in Management program in both the Fall 2011 (73%) and Spring 2012 (69%) semesters and in the Bachelor of Social Work program in the Fall 2011 (60%) semester. In all graduate programs, the percentage of course credit hours taught by full-time faculty was greater than 50%, with one exception which was adequately explained.

ASU offers multiple programs across its colleges in a predominantly on-line format. There are no discernible differences in the percentages of coursework taught by full-time faculty in these programs when compared to on-campus program offerings.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Institution's Compliance Certification Report with accompanying documentation and concurs with the compliance determination of the Off-Site Committee.

- 2.9** The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. **(Learning Resources and Services)**

The Porter Henderson Library provides collections, resources and services that support the institution's academic programs, both online and on campus. Angelo State does not offer instruction at off-campus site locations. Recent surveys of faculty (2012) and students (2011) indicate overall satisfaction with library resources and services.

Full library services are available 109 hours per week, and the Learning Commons is open an additional 28 hours per week. Reference services are extended to 24/7 through AskAcademic, an online reference consortium. A web portal designed specifically for online students provides easy access to resources and services. Users may access library collections at other institutions through interlibrary loan and TexShare, a statewide cooperative program.

Collections and spending per FTE student compare favorably to peer institutions. Access to online materials, including over 31,000 e-books and over 45,000 e-journals, has been enhanced by the implementation of EBSCO Discovery Service in Spring 2012. Databases and e-journal packages through TexShare and the Greater Western Library Alliance consortia add to electronic resources.

The library's collection development policy provides selection and weeding guidelines for all formats and collection categories as well as a materials budget allocation formula that ensures that each educational program is supported appropriately. The Library's Collection Development Team works with each academic department to select and maintain materials for collections. Librarians

also serve on college curriculum committees. Funds for library materials come from a variety of sources including state allocations, a library fee, and an Excellence Fund.

The University Library Committee, Student Senate, Faculty Senate, and other groups on campus collaborate to ensure that the library is responsive to needed changes. An example of this collaboration is the library fee that was proposed by the Student Senate and approved in a referendum of the student body in Spring 2001. The semester credit hour fee rose significantly from \$3 per semester credit hour to \$8 in the last four years. The revenues generated by the increase in fees enabled the remodeling and enhanced learning spaces in the Library that were completed in 2011.

- *2.10** The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. **(Student Support Services)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that student support programs, services and activities are described and documented in detail to demonstrate consistency with the mission of the institution and the relationship to the Master Goals in the ASU Strategic Plan. The Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management provides direction and oversight for these services. Evidence is provided for a comprehensive offering of student support services such as Student Involvement, Disability Services, Career Development, Housing and Residential Programs, University Recreation, University Health Clinic and Center for Counseling Services. Program examples as well as figures on student participation are included in the documentation.

The institution has been designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and has implemented grant-funded projects to improve services to students. The Student Support Center, a student-centered resource area, has been established to assist students in their transition to the campus and to college level learning. Other services include a Multicultural Center, a mentoring program for first-generation college students and targeted support for international students and student athletes. These are documented in more detail in the narrative for CS 3.4.9.

Many student services are available through the ASU website and the campus technology portal. These can be accessed from any location at any time for students taking on campus classes or enrolled in distance education courses.

A wide variety of academic support services are coordinated by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs under the umbrella of the Center for Academic Excellence. The programs include First-Year Experience, Honors Program, Office of Pre-declared Advising, Supplemental Instruction and the Tutoring Center. Further detail about these services is provided in the narrative for CR 2.9 Learning Resources and Services.

Full descriptions of student support programs and services to both undergraduate and graduate students are provided, as well as a narrative relating the student support services and programs to the mission of the

institution. Documentation is provided to show that services are provided to distance learning students, including information found under links to such student support services as Career Development, Counseling Services, Disability Services and others.

An interview conducted with the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee confirmed ASU's commitment to continued improvement of these support areas both on campus and online. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews (as noted above) in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 2.11.1** The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or *Standard Review Report* issued in accordance with *Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services* issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a systemwide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or *Standard Review Report*) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. **(Financial Resources)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine compliance since the FY2012 Audited Financial Statement and Management Letter were not available at the time of the review. The institution did provide evidence that the FY2012 budget was approved by the Board of Regents on August 5, 2011. In addition, the committee was able to observe financial stability through Financial Statements for FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011 as well as positive enrollment trends (TTUS Fitch Ratings Report). The committee also noted that growth of the operating and non-operating revenues along with controlled expenses indicates proper financial management as confirmed by a healthy Current Ratio in FY2011. The Compliance Report contains evidence of budget planning and structured approval processes up through the Board of Regents.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee review of Financial Statements and Independent Accountant's Review Report for FY2011 and FY2012 provided evidence of institutional financial stability. The Board approval of the Summary Operating Budget for FY2012 and FY2013 was evidenced by the Board of Regents Minutes, August 5, 2011 and August 9, 2012, respectively. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also interviewed the Interim Vice President for Finance & Administration, the Assistant Vice President for Finance & Administration, and the Executive Director and Controller. The Statement of Financial Position of Unrestricted Net Assets Exclusive of Plant Assets and Plant Related Debt for FY2010, 2011, and FY2012 further reflects overall compliance with this standard.

2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. **(Physical Resources)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee determined that ASU has a structured facilities master plan to address the fiscal resources needed for teaching and research. The master plan, updated in 2011, addresses classroom and laboratory square foot requirements in anticipation of enrollment growth. However, the committee could not determine compliance in that no information was made available to indicate the quality and condition of the space. Also, no pattern of evidence was presented that a preventative maintenance plan has been operationalized.

Clear policies exist for inventory, facilities management services, key controls, vehicle use and procurement services; however, no evidence is presented to demonstrate application of policy. As part of the Texas Tech University System, the institution is governed by the TTUS system for facilities planning; capital expansion, repair and renovation; and resource management programs.

The institution assesses the condition of all its buildings annually and submits the findings of the assessment in a Building Condition Report to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. That report was reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. As shown in the Building Condition Report, 61 (87%) of ASU's buildings are in good condition per the Board's definitions. Only one building, the Concho Hall student residence, is in need of major remodeling and that project has begun according to interview information.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with Facilities Management staff to understand how the ASU personnel utilize the FAMIS system to coordinate all maintenance activities as well as track costs, labor, and scheduling. Discussions with staff also clarified program schedule inspections, adjustments, testing, and component replacement related to the institution's preventative maintenance program.

Work order documents, including initiating requests and work order crew summaries were reviewed to determine how departmental staff can initiate work orders using the online self-service function and how those orders are processed. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also examined numerous documents to ensure the application of facilities policies, including the 2012 property inventory, a fleet vehicle use report, and a key issuance report. Thus, through the above noted evidence and interviews, the committee determines ASU to have appropriate physical facilities to support the mission of the institution.

2.12 The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the

environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. **(Quality Enhancement Plan)**

The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). See Part III for additional information.

C. Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards

- 3.1.1** The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution's operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution's constituencies. **(Mission).**

Angelo State University's mission statement is complete and comprehensive, and the Compliance Report documents currency by showing how the mission is aligned with the seven master goals of the strategic plan. Further, the institution documented the publication of the mission statement in both electronic and printed form. The mission statement was last reviewed and approved by the TTUS Board of Regents and the THECB in 2009.

- 3.2.1** The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer. **(CEO evaluation/selection)**

Ample documentation in the form of TTUS Regents Rules was provided to establish that the TTUS Board of Regents has the authority to appoint the President of Angelo State University with the recommendation of the Chancellor who is the CEO of the TTUS. The Regents Rules also establish an annual evaluation report on each president in the system to the Board by the Chancellor. These reports are reviewed in executive session. A memorandum from the Chair of the TTUS Board of Regents documented that the ASU President's last evaluation was reviewed on December 15, 2011.

Due to the hire of a new President since the Off-Site review, the On-Site Committee reviewed the process for the selection as well as the credentials of the new President. The review was conducted through interviews with senior administrators and Board of Regents' members and review of TTUS Regents' Rules. All appropriate processes were followed and credentials verified.

- 3.2.2** The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution's governance structure: **(Governing board control)**

3.2.2.1 the institution's mission

The Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System (TTUS) clearly has the documented governance authority to approve the Angelo State University mission and has exercised that authority most recently on March 6, 2009.

3.2.2.2 the fiscal stability of the institution

The Compliance Report adequately documented the authority and control of the TTUS Board in discharging its fiduciary responsibilities for Angelo State University. Appropriate sections of the Regents Rules in the areas of budget approval and oversight, debt management, and auditing requirements were provided. Documentation for the board's actions for this standard was found in CS 3.2.6.

3.2.2.3 institutional policy

The TTUS Board of Regents is vested with responsibility for the "government, control, and direction of the policies" of all component institutions of the Texas Tech University System, of which ASU is a member. Appropriate investiture is found in the Texas Education Code (TEC) §109.21 and *Section 01.02.1* of the Regents' Rules.

3.2.3 The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members. (Board conflict of interest)

There are two levels of policy prohibiting conflict of interest by members of the TTUS Board of Regents. These include "The Rules and Regulations of the Texas Tech University System, Board of Regents" and the Texas Government Code which is applicable to all agents of the state. These policies are internally consistent. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not determine compliance since the Compliance Certification Report did not include evidence (e.g., minutes or signed conflict policy statements) of the implementation of the policy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents that provide evidence of the implementation of pertinent conflict of interest policies. An executed conflict of interest statement was examined that certifies the board member has reviewed conflict of interest policies and is in compliance with those policies. Each year, every board member is further required by state law to prepare and submit to the Texas Ethics Commission a Personal Financial Statement that discloses the financial interests of the board member and the board member's family; an executed form was reviewed. The institution also provided the committee a listing of examples and documentation from board meeting minutes on seven occasions when a board member had recused himself or herself from discussion or a vote on agenda items at meetings due to real or perceived conflicts of interest on the part of the board member.

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. (External influence)

The Compliance Report provided a detailed description of the structural features designed to protect Angelo State University from undue external influence. This included references to the composition of the TTUS Board of Regents and the staggered terms of members, compliance with Texas open meetings and open records laws, and statutory and policy provisions addressing ethics and conflict of interest. In addition, the report cited TEC §51.352 which requires all Board

members “to preserve institutional independence and to defend (the institution’s) right to manage its own affairs through its chosen administrators and employees.”

- 3.2.5** The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. **(Board dismissal)**

The Compliance Report cited Texas Government Code §572.051 and §572.058 which, respectively, prohibit conflicts of interest and spell out the procedure by which a state officer (including TTUS Regents) might be removed from office for violating the conflict of interest prohibition. Code §572.051 further requires all state agencies to adopt code of ethics policies implementing the provisions of the law.

In its response to CS 3.2.3, Board Conflict of Interest, Angelo State University documented fulfillment of this legal requirement by providing pertinent TTUS Regents Rules from Sections 1 and 3. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not determine compliance in that the documentation provided did not indicate the possibility of removal of office for any cause other than violating conflict of interest and does not present process procedures for removal for cause of any member of the Board.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verified through interviews that Texas Tech University System (TTUS) rules outline various aspects of appropriate board conduct but do not speak to any specific sanctions for violations. TTUS regents can be removed for appropriate enumerated reasons (e.g., nepotism, private interest in a decision, breach of trust) and by certain process procedures based on the Texas Government Code (TGC), which in turn is based on the Texas Constitution (Article XV, Section 9).

TGC Chapter 572 includes regents in its definition of appointed officers and defines the standards of conduct expected of appointed officers. Possible sanctions for violations of behaviors include being "subject to any applicable civil or criminal penalty if the violation also constitutes a violation of another statute or rule." TGC Chapter 572 as provided to the On-Site Committee also defines removal from office for violation of private interest in a measure of decision.

A memorandum from the TTUS Office of the General Counsel provided to the On-Site Committee indicates that board member removal from office can only take place by the attorney general or by a district court. As appointed officers of the State of Texas, board members can be impeached. The Texas Government Code defines impeachment and the process procedures for same and that section of the TGC was reviewed by the On-Site Committee. No board member has even been removed or impeached.

- 3.2.6** There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. **(Board/administration distinction)**

The Compliance Report documents that there is an appropriate distinction between the governance and policy functions of the TTUS Board of Regents, the TTUS Chancellor, and the President and administration of Angelo State University. This is well-embedded in statute, in the Rules of the TTUS Board of Regents, and in the ASU OP 01.03, Organization of Angelo State University. However, the Off-Site Committee noted that the institution did not document that the distinction is observed in practice.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with the President, Texas Tech University System (TTUS) board chair, and a TTUS board member who had also previously been a member of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. It is the determination of the On-Site Committee that there exists a clear and appropriate distinction observed in practice between the policy making functions of the TTUS board of regents and system administration and the day-to-day responsibility to the ASU administration and faculty for administering and implementing policy at the institutional level.

A recent example of the distinction between roles involved updates to smoking policies was cited. TTUS established a requirement that its institutions adopt smoking policies. ASU, as a constituent institution of TTUS, provided documentation to the On-Site Committee that its local policy was different than that of the other TTUS component institutions. Minutes were provided to the Committee which noted that the policies had already been separately approved administratively by each institution's president.

Interview findings indicated a similar situation exists for other areas of governance, including promotion and tenure. Board minutes were provided to the On-Site Committee that demonstrated the manner by which multiple administrative levels at the institution determine administrative practice within the context of overall TTUS policy.

3.2.7 The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. **(Organizational structure)**

The Compliance Report documented compliance with this standard by providing the statutory and regulatory authorization for the institution, with a detailed organization chart, and by providing a copy of ASU OP 01.03, Organization of Angelo State University, which presents the general responsibilities for each of the institution's major administrative and academic officers.

*** 3.2.8** The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution. **(Qualified administrative/academic officers)**

The academic and experiential backgrounds of the administrative and academic officers of Angelo State University are detailed in the narrative and attachments included with the Compliance Report. A review of this documentation indicates that the incumbent individuals have appropriate academic qualifications and substantive relevant experience for the positions they hold.

During the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's visit the institution disclosed that nine administrative and academic officers had changed since the Off-Site review. The university was actively holding searches for two of its three vice presidents.

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that the institution have qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution.

- 3.2.9** The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. **(Personnel appointment)**

The institution follows state guidelines regarding appointment of personnel. Sufficient documentation was presented to demonstrate that policies guiding appointment and evaluation exist. The institution provided redacted evaluative materials for staff at several levels in the institution (e.g. Director Coordinator, Manager).

- 3.2.10** The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators. **(Administrative staff evaluations)**

The University has a well-defined evaluation process for administrative staff. Policy and Procedures for performance evaluations were complete. Redacted examples for a Vice President and an Associate Vice President are presented as evidence of the completed process. The evaluation process includes surveying the faculty and staff for Dean and Department Head/Chair evaluations.

- 3.2.11** The institution's chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution's intercollegiate athletics program. **(Control of intercollegiate athletics)**

The Angelo State University organization chart reflects that the Director of Athletics reports directly to the President. In addition, ASU OP 20.02 clearly provides that the "President of the University shall provide direction to the athletic department to ensure compliance with all applicable rules, regulations, bylaws and laws governing intercollegiate athletics." This is reaffirmed in the Angelo State Athletic Department Policies and Procedures Manual which also establishes the President's oversight role with the Athletics Council. The President's ultimate responsibility for athletic finances, including private support, was also documented.

- 3.2.12** The institution demonstrates that its chief executive officer controls the institution's fund-raising activities. **(Fund-raising activities).**

Presidents of Texas Tech System member institutions are specifically charged with the responsibility for fund-raising by the TTUS Board of Regents Rules (02.04.2). The Compliance Report further documented compliance with this standard by providing references to Angelo State University policies and procedures applicable to fund-raising. Minutes of the ASU foundation meetings provided evidence of control by the institution's CEO.

- 3.2.13** For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs: (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. **(Institution-related entities)**

Signed Memorandum of Understandings provide authority and control for six separate entities formed in support of the university. Clearly defined expectations were apparent in the policy documents establishing the role of each organization and its relationship to the university.

- 3.2.14** The institution's policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. **(Intellectual property rights)**

Angelo State adopted an Intellectual Property Rights Policy in June 2011 to further expand on the Regents Rules policy that applies to all faculty, students and staff at all institutions of the Texas Tech University System, of which ASU is a member. These two policies address ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues and use of revenue derived from creation and production of all intellectual property. ASU faculty, staff and students are informed of these policies on the Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer web page. Disputes are resolved by the TTU System Office of Research, Commercialization, and Federal Relations.

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

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the institution has identified learning outcomes for all baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level programs. The institution provided one-to-two-year period assessment cycles for review. The institution gathers information from education programs through its Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) software. The extent to which individual programmatic student learning outcomes were achieved and the connection between analysis of assessment results and improvements made was clearly demonstrated. The SPOL Planning Objective Reports for AY 2011 and AY 2012 offered documentation of engagement in systematic and ongoing annual assessment.

The institution also reports having comparative assessment results by course delivery method (online and traditional) in the SPOL; however, no

documentation of assessments for online programs was provided; thus, the Off-Site Committee could not determine compliance.

In the Focused Report, the institution states that, “all academic assessment processes and instruments used in the core curriculum and academic programs are applied consistently across sections of a course, regardless of delivery method. Results are able to be separated by delivery method (online and traditional) for the purposes of comparing results and making needed improvements.” The institution provided a single example of such a comparison in the Focused Report.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed program assessment reports and related documentation from all programs in each college and at each level of instruction, (including Undergraduate Assessment Reports 2009-2012, Graduate Assessment Reports 2009-2012) and examples of non-student-learning-outcome planning objectives to support compliance of academic programs with the whole of CS 3.3.1.1 as well as compliance with the standard regarding on-line instruction.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed specific examples of assessments that compared outcome results of students taking courses using both traditional and on-line delivery methodologies. Documentation was provided that the institution not only has the capability to disaggregate results by method of delivery but does so on a routine basis. Three primary reporting tools facilitate this process, including the use of Blackboard to share results, the Cognos reporting tool, and Banner.

Further, the IT department provides several self-service tools and on-line reports to allow comparisons and to drill down into assessment results in a variety of ways. The Associate Vice President of Information Technology and his staff work closely with individual faculty members, departments, and assessment coordinators within the colleges to provide custom designed reports, localized results, etc. that provide an efficient and powerful array of tools to allow a rigorous assessment of both traditional and on-line instruction. The institution has now repurposed a field within its primary assessment collection database (SPOL) that will allow results to be displayed comparatively among method of delivery for all programs and courses.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also interviewed the Director of Institutional Planning, Policy and Effectiveness, the Executive Director of Library Services, the Associate Vice President of Information Technology and CIO, the Assistant Vice President for Research and Accountability, and the Coordinator of Academic Assessment.

Based on its review of initial compliance materials, additional documentation provided on-site and interviews with key personnel as described above, the On-Site Committee finds the institution identified expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and has provided evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

The institution has identified outcomes/objectives for individual administrative support services, demonstrated the extent to which these outcomes were achieved, and presented analysis of assessment results and improvements made. The AY2011 and AY2012 administrative support services SPOL reports (i.e., Planning Objective Reports) were made available for review along with other pertinent documents (e.g., Centennial Master Plan).

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

Academic and student support services are housed in the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs/Enrollment Management. The institution has identified outcomes/objectives for each academic and student support services unit that is aligned to institutional goals and to institutional planning priorities (Vision 2020). SPOL reports from AY2011 and AY2012 demonstrated the extent to which operational effectiveness outcomes and student learning outcomes were achieved and showed the connection between analysis of assessment results and improvements made.

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

The institution addresses research under Master Goal 4, Objective 4 of its Strategic Plan. The institution has identified operational effectiveness objectives for graduate and undergraduate-level research, demonstrated the extent to which the objectives were achieved, and shown the connection between analysis of assessment results and improvements made.

Sufficient documentation of the Office of Sponsored Projects engaging in a systematic and ongoing annual assessment process is evident in the SPOL Planning Objective Reports for AY2011 and AY2012 as well as in Vision 2020.

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Five departments (the Center for International Studies; Extended Studies; the Small Business Development Center; the Center for Community Wellness, Engagement, and Development; and the San Jacinto Clinic) are particularly involved in fulfilling the university's public service goals as defined in Vision 2020. The institution has identified operational effectiveness objectives for community/public service, demonstrated the extent to which the objectives were achieved, and shown the connection between analysis of assessment results and improvements effected. The SPOL Planning Objective Reports for AY 2011 and AY2012 were provided.

- 3.3.2** The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. **(Quality Enhancement Plan)**

The institution satisfactorily addressed all components of this standard. See Part III for additional information.

- 3.4.1** The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. **(Academic program approval)**

The institution follows a clear process of curricular control with specific policies for approval of bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs. Internal policies and procedures are consistent with Texas Administrative Code requirements. Evidence from approval of the BBS in Homeland Security is presented to demonstrate that the articulated policies are followed.

- 3.4.2** The institution's continuing education, outreach, and service programs are consistent with the institution's mission. **(Continuing education/service programs)**

Each of the units comprising Angelo State's continuing education, outreach, and service programs, including the Centers/ Offices for International Studies, Community Wellness, Engagement and Development, Small Business Development and Extended Studies, engages in a systematic annual assessment process that ensures ongoing alignment with the institutional mission.

- *3.4.3** The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission. **(Admissions policies)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that undergraduate admissions policies, including criteria for automatic admission, are approved by the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System and reflect requirements of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The standards are clearly defined in the undergraduate catalog and recruitment materials as well as on institutional websites. Admission categories include GED, dual credit/concurrent enrollment, transfer, former ASU students, transient, non-degree seeking and international. An "academic fresh start" option is provided for applicants with academic work at least ten years old.

The Admissions Committee reviews the policies every two years and makes recommendations for changes. The Admissions Committee also reviews applicants not eligible under regular admission requirements. Program-specific undergraduate admission requirements are outlined for majors such as Nursing and Educator Preparation. The same admission standards are used for distance education students as for students in programs delivered on campus.

General as well as specific program requirements including prerequisites, GPA and testing criteria for graduate admissions are documented in the graduate catalog and on program websites. Admission policies are developed by program faculty and the Graduate Council and then approved by the Board of Regents. Admission is granted by the Dean of The College of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the department of proposed study. A College of Graduate Studies brochure provides an overview of the programs and the degree options available.

Admission policies of the institution are provided in full and documented on program websites as well as in ASU catalogues, all readily available to students, faculty, staff and the wider public. The bases of the institution's admission policies, by program, and their mission relevance, clarity, consistent implementation and appropriateness of student qualifications are all in evidence and published online. An interview with the Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (VPSAEM) confirmed the institution's continuing commitment to ensuring admissions-policy relevance and availability.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents as identified above and conducted interviews the Registrar and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 3.4.4** The institution publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution's own degree programs. The institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript. *(See Commission policy "Collaborative Academic Arrangements.")* **(Acceptance of academic credit)**

ASU has numerous policies in place that specify processes and procedures for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit. Policies are published in multiple places such as catalogs and the university website for easy access. Although the Office of Admissions evaluates credits, only the academic dean of the college offering a program may make the decision about which courses are applied to specific programs.

The institution specifies the number of undergraduate and graduate semester credit hours that may be transferred. Policies governing credit by examination such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) are detailed. Policies for the transfer of credit for international students are provided. No credit is given for experiential or non-academic work. ASU's policies are consistent with state requirements pertaining to the Texas Common Course Numbering System and limitations for awarding credit.

- 3.4.5** The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and

other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution. **(Academic policies)**

Academic policies are consistent with principles of sound educational practice and are published and accessible in numerous locations including undergraduate and graduate catalogs and faculty and student manuals.

- 3.4.6** The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. **(Practices for awarding credit)**

ASU has a sound practice for determining the credit awarded in undergraduate and graduate courses. The institution's policy follows the US Department of Education and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board definition of a credit hour. The Texas Common Course Numbering System is utilized to aid students in transfer of general academic credits. Coursework offered in an alternative format such as courses delivered on-line follow a review process consistent with Texas Administrative Code, Rule 4.6 to ensure that courses are "reviewed and approved through a formal, institutional faculty review process that evaluates the course and its learning outcomes and determines that the course does, in fact, have equivalent learning outcomes to an equivalent, traditionally delivered course."

All new programs and courses and proposed revisions to exiting programs and courses are reviewed and approved by faculty committees and appropriate administrators. All courses and programs offered via distance learning follow the same formal curricular approval process as for on-campus offerings. Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee meeting of 10/14/2011 provide evidence of the review process.

Policies for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer and experiential learning as well as policies for awarding credit by examination were presented in CS 3.4.4 of the Compliance Report. ASU's policies for awarding credits are published in numerous places such as the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs and in the Operating Policy and Procedure Manual.

- 3.4.7** The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the *Principles* and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution. (See the *Commission policy "Collaborative Academic Arrangements."*) **(Consortia relationships/contractual agreements)**

The institution reports having no consortia relationships or contractual agreements.

- 3.4.8** The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience. **(Noncredit to credit)**

Angelo State University's Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs both state that the institution does not allow credit earned by experience.

3.4.9 The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Academic support services)

The institution provides a comprehensive offering of academic support services for students as well as faculty in a learning-centered environment consistent with its mission and goals. The Center for Academic Excellence coordinates academic support services. The Dean of the recently created Freshman College has responsibility for overseeing these services. The SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising and Registration) program is designed to assist students in the transition to college.

The First-Year Experience (FYE) program includes a resource guide in printed and online versions. A Critical Thinking course, USTD 1201 is also offered. All first-year students on academic probation after the first semester are required to take USTD 1101: Learning Strategies. The Tutor Educate Advise Mentor (TEAM) Office reaches out to students exhibiting at-risk behavior such as frequent absences or incomplete assignments. This alert system facilitates referrals to campus resources.

The institution has a structured, mandatory and proactive advising system in place, using advising centers in each academic college and an Office of Pre-Declared Advising for students who have not selected a major. A requirement that students must declare a major before earning 30 semester hours has been implemented.

Other support services include supplemental instruction, mentoring, and ASU SMART (Students Mapping a Right Track), the umbrella program that coordinates tutoring resources including the Accounting Lab, Math Lab, Modern Language Tutoring and the Writing Center. SMART also provides academic and study skills workshops and online tutoring free to students. All SMART student participation is tracked to document usage and make improvements. Academic support services in general are evaluated using a variety of assessment tools.

Targeted support services are provided for specific student populations such as students with disabilities, first-generation students, international students, and athletes.

Student development and co-curricular programs include Counseling, Career Development, Student Involvement, Housing and Residential Programs and University Recreation. ASU's designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution has provided grant funding to improve the campus academic support structure. Workshops and professional development are available for faculty and staff in areas such as teaching, technology, cultural awareness, inclusion and diversity. The Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research provides faculty-focused programs on instructional strategies to improve teaching and student learning.

Many student services are available through the ASU website and the campus technology portal. These can be accessed from any location at any time for

students taking on-ground classes or enrolled in distance education courses. The Library offers a 24 hour reference service – AskAcademic. An online Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) tool provides a degree evaluation and charts progress toward completion.

Academic support services are publicized on the website and in the catalogs, with reference to university policy as appropriate. The Student Opinion Survey, NSSE and focused faculty surveys indicate that student needs are being met.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. **(Responsibility for curriculum)**

The faculty maintains responsibility for curriculum content, quality and effectiveness through required and active engagement in the curriculum approval process and the institutional effectiveness process. Further, faculty are expected to engage in ongoing study of the subject matter of their disciplines, present the most current and useful knowledge, and ensure that the material being taught is consistent with the course of study outlined by the department or college.

Assessment of the effectiveness of the curriculum involves faculty at all levels, first through assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level. Student learning outcomes are tied to program learning goals and university learning goals and are reviewed by the faculty-led Academic Assessment Committee.

***3.4.11** For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. **(Academic program coordination)**

The Off-Site Committee noted that the institution is in the process of transitioning from a permanent department chairperson position system to a three-year rotating position system for all department chairs. Responsibility for program coordination presently rests with department chairpersons or other faculty identified as program coordinators. The Off-Site Review of listed responsible parties showed appropriate assignment of coordination duties in most areas except for Art, Management Information Systems and Sociology/ Social Work, for which no coordinator is identified with academic credentials in the respective disciplines.

The committee also noted that several colleges and departments at ASU were reorganized in 2011, resulting in the merging of some departments and the elimination of others as separate units. Academic programs that hold unique accrediting needs (e.g., Social Work, Physical Therapy, etc.) are assigned separate program coordinators. However, not all programs housed within multi-program departments are assigned a single point person.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the Dean of the College of Education and the faculty member who compiled the Faculty Credential Roster. The name and qualifications of the program coordinator for the Social Work

program validated that he is academically qualified in Social Work to coordinate the program. While program coordination for Art, Management Information Systems, and Sociology are the responsibility of the department chairpersons rather than an academically qualified person in the respective disciplines, the institution demonstrated through curriculum review process examples that curriculum development and review are the purview of the faculty in the relevant discipline.

3.4.12 The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. **(Technology use)**

ASU's Information Technology Strategic Plan includes an objective to "partner with academic and service departments to provide instructional technology services that enhance the teaching and learning environment." The RamPort portal, the Blackboard Academic Suite, and "smart" or computer-based classrooms provide a platform for enhancing student learning.

Academic programs in all five colleges use a variety of discipline-specific technologies to enhance student learning including the Management, Instruction and Research Center, a searchable database of natural history specimens; a television studio; a Usability Testing Lab; the ASU Planetarium; business research databases; an interactive visualization environment for security studies; the Innovative Teaching Center for teacher candidates; and the High-Fidelity Simulation Laboratory for nursing students.

Students have access to RamPort, Blackboard, the campus wireless network, and online library resources 24/7. The Math/ Computer Science computer lab and Library Learning Commons provide access to computers, laptops, printing and scanning services, and technical assistance. Additional assistance is available from the Technology Service Desk during office hours or through a 24-hour "Help" hotline.

The e-Learning Center provides on-campus training courses and online tutorials to students and faculty, with special services targeted to distance education students. The Porter Henderson Library offers workshops and online tutorials, and the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research offers a wide array of technology training opportunities for faculty.

ASU ensures that technology needs are met appropriately through an annual technology services survey, course-level evaluations and assessment of student learning, and departmental assessments.

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. **(General education competencies)**

The institution's University Core Curriculum conforms to requirement of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) is responsible for defining the University Core Curriculum requirements in accordance with THECB guidelines and ensuring that

they are aligned with the institution's undergraduate learning goals, mission, and values.

The institution has identified college-level education competencies and provided sufficient documentation to demonstrate the extent to which students have attained these competencies. Sufficient examples of documentation were made available including: Communication Assessment Report, MAPP Results, Curriculum Assessments and Results, Core Assessment Results, and Improvement Plans (Fall 2011 and Spring 2012), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results, and the IDEA Summary Report for Core Curriculum Natural Sciences, Fall 2011.

3.5.2 At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (*See the Commission policy "Collaborative Academic Arrangements."*) **(Institutional credits for a degree).**

The narrative in support of compliance reasons that a bachelor's degree includes completion of a minimum of 120 semester credit hours and a minimum of 30 semester credit hours in residence, thereby meeting the standard that at least 25% of semester credit hours required for the bachelor's degree will be earned through instruction offered by ASU. However, the Off-Site Committee observed that some ASU degrees such as the BA with a concentration in Communication with teacher certification and the BS in Interdisciplinary Studies require more than 120 hours, 123 and 128 respectively. For such degrees, students must complete more than 30 hours in residence in order to meet the 25% requirement.

While a sample degree audit is provided for a program that requires 120 hours, none was provided for a degree that requires more than 120 hours. There is also no documentation of a process to ensure that the coursework taken by each graduate meets the 25% requirement.

Degree requirements, including the minimum residency requirements, are monitored through RamPort, an online degree evaluation system. Individual colleges within the university complete degree audits in RamPort for those students who have applied for graduation and verify whether or not each student meets degree requirements. Colleges then submit the results to the registrar. This degree audit process ensures that students complete the minimum requirement of 25% of credit hours in residence required to earn a bachelor's degree.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the online catalog, sampled degree evaluations from a variety of academic programs in excess of 120 credit hours required for earning the degree, and interviewed the Registrar, Dean of the College of Education, and a faculty member in a degree program that requires 125 semester hours. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee saw evidence of the process for ensuring that students' coursework must meet the minimum 25% residency requirement for all programs. The Registrar provided confirmation that the update on residence requirements for all programs requiring more than 120 credit hours will be effective for Fall 2013.

Students receive credit when transferring course work from another college or university in accordance with ASU transfer credit guidelines, and as of Fall 2011, grade letter designations for transfer course work on the ASU transcript are identified as TA, TB, TC, TD, and TF, accompanied by the name of the institution from which the credit was transferred. These designations enable transfer course work to be distinctly identified and separated from institutional course work and coursework transferred prior to Fall 2011.

- 3.5.3** The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. *(See the Commission policy "Collaborative Academic Arrangements.")* **(Undergraduate program requirements)**

ASU has published institutional requirements for all undergraduate programs that conform to the Texas Classification of Instructional Programs taxonomy and to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) criteria and regulations. The institution's role, mission, and all degree programs are reviewed every four years by the THECB and the Board of Regents. Programs offered via distance education are approved and reviewed through the same process as on-campus programs.

The general education core at ASU conforms to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board regulations which require every public institution of higher education in Texas to establish a core curriculum of at least 42 semester credit hours. Information about each undergraduate program is published in the ASU Undergraduate Catalog and is also available on the university website.

- 3.5.4** At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. **(Terminal degrees of faculty)**

In all of the baccalaureate degrees offered by ASU, at least 25% of the course hours are taught by faculty with terminal degrees. In more than one-half of the programs, a large majority of the course hours are taught by faculty with terminal degrees. One program of note is the Nursing Program which has only a 26% coverage of faculty with the terminal degree.

- 3.6.1** The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program rigor)**

The institution's graduate programs are progressively more advanced in academic content and expectations than its undergraduate programs. As an example, the curriculum map for the Agriculture Department provides evidence of content becoming progressively more difficult and performance expectations becoming greater as programs move from undergraduate to graduate. A review of other programs found in the Academic Catalog confirmed that such a progression was evident elsewhere in the curriculum.

- 3.6.2** The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. **(Graduate curriculum)**

At the institutional level, the College of Graduate Studies has established and published a set of student learning goals that are appropriate for graduate-level education and common to all programs. Further, at the program level, discipline-specific learning goals are linked to these overarching learning goals. Graduate curricula are designed to provide a foundation of theoretical knowledge and applied discipline-specific professional and clinical learning experiences.

The doctoral program at ASU includes sequenced professional courses that establish a knowledge base in foundational, behavioral, and clinical sciences; student engagement in research and appropriate professional practice; seminars; clinical experiences and hands-on practicum experiences.

A review of curricula at the master's level found that it includes courses that explore the literature (both theoretical and applied) and ensure student engagement in research and professional practice.

- 3.6.3** At least one-third of credits toward a graduate or a post-baccalaureate professional degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. *(See the Commission policy "Collaborative Academic Arrangements.")* **(Institutional credits for a degree)**

No transfer credit is allowed in the lock-step, sequential curriculum for the doctoral program, thereby assuring that the entire program is completed at ASU.

ASU allows the transfer of a maximum of six semester credit hours in a 30 credit hour master's program and a maximum of nine semester credit hours in a program of more than 30 hours, meeting the minimum one-third in-house requirement. Sample transcripts provide evidence that ASU offers sufficient coursework to meet and exceed required residential graduate hours.

Both online and on-campus programs follow the same policies regarding the transfer of credits.

- 3.6.4** The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-graduate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program requirements)**

The institution defines and publishes requirements for graduate and post-baccalaureate programs in the Graduate Catalog and in the brochure for the College of Graduate Studies. Further, program-specific websites contain easily accessible information for current and prospective students. Graduate programs conform to requirements set by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

- 3.7.1** The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See *Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials."*) **(Faculty competence)**

Based on the summary of faculty qualifications provided in the Faculty Roster' the Off-Site Review Committee identified faculty members whose credentials do not seem to qualify them for the courses they are assigned to teach: College of Business, six faculty members; College of Education, three faculty members; one faculty member in Health and Human Services, and three faculty in Arts and Sciences.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the faculty credential information contained in the ASU Focused Report as well as curriculum vitae, academic transcripts, and transcript evaluation for five remaining faculty members. Two of the five faculty members in question have left the institution, although one of whom was determined subsequently qualified to teach based on academic credentials; the other faculty member will no longer receive a teaching appointment at ASU. Documentation provided by Human Resources confirms the separation of this faculty member from the institution. The Committee supports that the remaining three faculty members meet the academic qualifications to teach in their respective disciplines based on a review of their academic transcripts, curriculum vitae, and interviews with the Dean of Education and the faculty member who developed the faculty credentials roster.

- 3.7.2** The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. **(Faculty evaluation)**

All faculty members undergo a standardized annual evaluation, regardless of tenure or non-tenure eligibility (full-time or part-time) status, consistent with published policies. A recommendation from the Department Peer Review Committee is made to the department head that completes an evaluation that includes results of student evaluations of teaching. A portfolio with the department head's recommendation is sent to the Provost for further review and ultimate decision making. Post-tenure review is carried out in accordance with The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System *Section 04.03, Regents' Rules*. Sample evaluations provide evidence of implementation of the processes.

- 3.7.3** The institution provides evidence of ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. **(Faculty development)**

There are multiple faculty development opportunities at ASU. The Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research provides academic support for teaching, research, mentoring, and service. Additional support is provided for faculty utilizing a distance education mode of instruction. Further, the Summer Institute on Teaching and Learning provides faculty with an additional focused opportunity for professional development. Ongoing opportunities also exist through offerings by Human Resources Training and Development, the e-Learning Center, and the Hispanic Serving Institution Project Office. Faculty research is supported through the Office of Sponsored Programs. Data was provided on faculty participation in development opportunities.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. **(Academic freedom)**

Angelo State University has a policy on academic freedom published in its Operating Policy and Procedure Manual that is consistent with Regents Rules. The institution has a publicized policy for updating existing operating policies and publishing new policy drafts on its web site. Faculty academic freedom is protected under ASU OP 06.23, Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures for issues related to tenure and promotion. ASU OP 06.11, Faculty Grievance Procedures protects faculty rights to academic freedom when the issue does not involve tenure and promotion. No faculty member has filed a grievance for a violation of academic freedom since the last SACSCOC reaffirmation in 2002.

3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. **(Faculty role in governance)**

The institution publishes several documents which demonstrate the expected responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. The Faculty Manual explains the areas of faculty governance as do the Graduate and Undergraduate Catalogs. However, no examples of faculty participation in governance matters were presented. The committee reported that while documentation was provided to address the various roles of faculty and academic leaders in academic matters (curriculum decisions, program reviews, tenure and promotion, etc.), no examples were provided of direct faculty or Faculty Senate participation in broader, institution-wide governance and policy-making matters.

The On-Site Committee review of the information in the Focused Report and interviews with the Faculty Senate President and a Faculty Senate Senator and affirmed that there is substantial faculty participation and leadership in curriculum, tenure, and other areas of academic matters. The Faculty Senate is working on new operational procedures and documents to build some structure for these discussions, and is hopeful that the recent appointment of the President and the selection of the new Provost will further strengthen efforts to create a culture of shared governance and direct participation in broader, institutional-wide policy and planning, which in turn should enhance the faculty governance climate on the campus.

3.8.1 The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission.
(Learning/information resources)

The Porter Henderson Library is an 80,000 square feet facility with 476 seats and a variety of resources and services, including group study rooms, individual study carrels, microform equipment, wireless access to the campus network, and traditional library services as described in more detail in Core Requirement 2.9. The recently remodeled Learning Commons provides 44 networked computer, 52 laptops available for checkout, printing and scanning equipment, photocopiers, and a Technical Assistance Desk staffed by Information Technology personnel. Responses from a 2011 student satisfaction survey indicate that the Learning Commons meets and exceeds student expectations and needs.

In CR 2.9, data is presented to demonstrate that the library supports the social work, business, nursing, athletic, training, and physical therapy programs as evidenced by outside accreditation agency findings that Library resources met or exceeded required standards. Further, the library has been able to demonstrate the adequacy of its resources to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to support several new program offerings since 2006. The Library has representation on college-level curriculum committees as well as the University Curriculum Committee, the Academic Affairs Council, and the Distance Education Council.

Student satisfaction responses from a 2011 survey indicate that students found the library facilities and service meet their needs. A similar survey in 2012 found that faculty were satisfied with the services of the library. Assessment of Library resources and services is embedded in Master Goal #2: "The University provides and maintains facilities appropriate for the University's academic and co-curricular programs", Objective #2: "Library resources and services reflect the needs of the University community."

Specific information relative to learning resources located outside the library was not included in the narrative but can be found in the reports on other standards. The Academic Resource Center on the third floor of the library brings together the Writing Center, Math Lab, Supplemental Instruction, and the Tutoring Center (see CS 3.4.9). As noted in CS 3.4.12, many departments have discipline-specific technology resources that support the teaching, research and service mission. Examples include the Management, Instruction and Research Center; ceramic studio and photography lab; television and radio stations; a Usability Testing Lab; the Entertainment Computing Laboratory; the SciDome digital projection system; and the High Fidelity Simulation Laboratory for the nursing program. Over 600 computers are located in labs and classrooms around campus including the Math/ Computer Science computer lab and 23 computer-based classrooms that allow access to discipline-specific software and various online resources.

Distance education students have access to library resources and services through the Library Resources for Distance Education Students webpage and to other learning resources through the RamPort campus portal.

3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. **(Instruction of library use)**

ASU offers regular and timely instruction in library use at several levels and in a variety of formats. The Information Literacy Corner, opened in 2011, is a flexible setting for hands-on instruction. Librarians provide face-to-face course-related and general instruction sessions for undergraduate classes as well as graduate classes. The Brief In-class Demonstration (BID) service allows faculty to ask a librarian to demonstrate a few relevant information resources in a brief period of time. In recent years, the library added information literacy to its mission statement and began using a library skills class assessment instrument. Faculty are informed of instruction opportunities for their students through a variety of means.

All students and library users, including distance learners, have access 24/7 to three self-paced online tutorials, other online library guides, and the LibGuides service which includes embedded instructional videos. Librarians provide a face-to-face introduction to library resources for online students in academic programs that require students to come to campus once per semester.

3.8.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources—to accomplish the mission of the institution. **(Qualified staff)**

The Porter Henderson Library employs eight librarians and two professional staff, all of whom possess the graduate degrees required for their positions. Educational qualifications and professional work history are provided using the SACSCOC template. The professional library staff participates in university committee work and are active in professional associations, holding office and making presentations at conferences. The library provides approximately \$6,000 per year to support professional development activities. Recent student (2011) and faculty (2012) surveys indicate satisfaction with the effectiveness of library services.

3.9.1 The institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement of student rights and responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. **(Student rights)**

The institution informs students of their rights and responsibilities as well as of applicable policies and procedures through the Student Handbook, ASU Operating Policies and Procedures, Residence Hall Handbook and the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. These rights and responsibilities are contained within the Academic Honor Code, Code of Student Conduct and Procedures Regarding Sexual or Racial Harassment. A general grievance and appeals procedure is available to students for complaints not covered by other published policies or regulations. The grievance procedure has clearly defined steps for students to follow and allows a tiered process for appeals.

3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. **(Student records).**

The institution has adequate policies and procedures to protect the security and confidentiality of student records. Students are informed of their rights under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) during orientation, in the Student Handbook and on the ASU website. The information provided outlines procedures for students to request access, indicates locations for various records, and specifically identifies Records Custodians. A Student Waiver to Release Education Information is easily accessible on the institution website.

Faculty and staff are granted access to student records only as needed to perform their specific job requirements. A Banner Request for Access Form includes information on FERPA and compliance expectations. All requests are evaluated, and access is granted based on employee roles. New employees are provided a FERPA Compliance Statement and are required to sign an Employee Acknowledgement and Certification Form that indicates they understand FERPA policy. A frequently asked questions page for faculty and staff is also available.

Student records are maintained in accordance with established institution policy and a records retention schedule approved by the appropriate state officials from the Records Management Division of the Texas State Library. Official academic records are securely stored. All electronic files, including imaged backup files, are maintained on electronically and physically secured databases and servers. A backup schedule has been established, and backups are sent off-site on a regular basis.

3.9.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. **(Qualified staff)**

The majority of student services are provided by the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM). Each department area is described in the Compliance Report (CR 2.10). A Vice President and an Associate Vice President manage the division. The administrative organization chart indicates that the Vice President reports to the President of the institution and is part of the senior leadership team.

An overview for job responsibilities for each professional position is provided, including educational qualifications and professional experience of each current employee. Generally the staff seem to have appropriate degrees and relevant experience for the position held.

Documentation is provided regarding recent attendance at external professional development conferences for some staff members but many have no professional development listed. It appears that professional development outside the institution is somewhat limited. Reference was made to the opportunity for internal administrative process training but no record of participation was documented. While the above information established the sufficiency of qualifications of the student affairs staff, there was not any

information provided to establish that the number of qualified staff is sufficient to accomplish the mission of the institution. Thus, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not determine compliance.

A full listing of professional development for currently employed SAEM staff is provided in the University Response section of the Focused Report under "Current Roster of SAEM Staff." The only gaps still existing in evidence before the onsite visit were for hires within the last four months. In an interview with the VPSAEM the On-Site Committee confirmed 1) that professional development for new hires was in evidence; and 2) that the Director of Budget, Planning and Policy, who oversees personnel matters for the division, meets with all new key staff members in the first 30 days after their hiring to ensure that professional development evidence is reflected on the roster, continues to be updated through annual evaluations and is captured through exit interviews for all departing staff, thereby avoiding gaps in documentation of compliance for future hires.

The "New SAEM Division Summary," as well as documentation found in ASU's narrative for CR 2.10, provides ample evidence of compliance with the standard with regard to sufficient numbers of qualified staff.

**3.10.1 The institution's recent financial history demonstrates financial stability.
(Financial stability)**

Angelo State University has experienced double digit revenue growth from tuition and fees; federal, state and private grants; and contracts. Sales and other sources of revenue have also grown over the past three years. Reductions in state support have been minimal, -3.1%, and limited to FY2011. All indications are that ASU has a very positive trend in total revenue growth up through 2011.

Controls are outlined in policies and procedures for management of financial resources. The change in net assets and unrestricted net assets has increased over the past three fiscal years.

The qualifications of Finance and Administration leadership appear to be appropriate and budget oversight and financial planning supports this judgment.

*** 3.10.2 The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. (Financial aid audits)**

The Department of Education's Eligibility and Certification Approval Report is current showing full eligibility and certification. The most recent DOE audit for Title IV for the period ending June 30 2011 shows two findings, both of which have been addressed by management.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the State of Texas Federal Portion of the Statewide Single Audit Reports and the US DOE letter in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

**3.10.3 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its financial resources.
(Control of finances)**

Policies and procedures are evident for cash controls, endowment funds, and approval of expenditures. Oversight by management and internal auditors for risk areas is supported by the ASU Office of EHS and Risk Management and extensive operating policy and procedures for every department. Information about the investment policy is presented as part of the TTU system policy.

However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee did not find evidence to indicate that mitigation of risk is exercised and did not find evidence of regular reconciliations.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed numerous examples of reconciliations provided in the focused report (bank account reconciliations, petty cash reconciliations, sales tax reconciliations, etc.) and the Texas System Annual Audit Report for August 9, 2012 as evidence of compliance with this standard. Additionally, the Director of Audit Services was interviewed as to risk based planning for the mitigation of institutional risks in support of compliance.

3.10.4 The institution maintains financial control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs. **(Control of sponsored research/external funds)**

ASU has published policies governing sponsored research contracts and grants. The Office of Sponsored Projects manages sponsored research programs to ensure awards are consistent with the university's mission. The Compliance Report indicates that the Controller's office works with the OSP and maintains the university financial records.

3.11.1 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. **(Control of physical resources)**

Procurement policies and procedures are evident and in compliance, Assets are inventoried and tracked through the State Comptroller's office. Physical plant management is governed primarily by the State Comptroller reporting and fund allocation processes. Facilities management was addressed in the Compliance Report section CS 3.11.3.

3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. **(Institutional environment)**

The institution has well-defined emergency preparedness policies and practices. ASU has achieved the NOAA Storm Ready designation. The police department has a safety and community outreach program covering many service areas. The Environmental Health, Safety and Risk Management Office shares responsibility for many campus environment initiatives.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee notes that the university has not updated its crime statistics for the FY2012 and the required Cleary Act Crime report is not posted for the Calendar Year 2012.

- *3.11.3** The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. **(Physical facilities)**

ASU has a comprehensive facilities master plan that clearly supports the university mission. Significant capital expansion has occurred in the last five years. The necessary documents to support an ongoing maintenance and repair program with a deferred maintenance list was presented. However, evidence of the implementation of the maintenance program was not available to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the institution's Campus Condition Index Report which had recently been completed and submitted to the State Coordinating Board. The report includes a list of all deferred maintenance, critical deferred maintenance, facility renovation, and facility adaption needs with a schedule to address them, as of the date of the report. Accumulated deferred maintenance included projects from prior years that were not included in the maintenance program. These projects were not included because their priority status was perceived to be lower than those funded within the budget; these covered postponed renewal and replacement maintenance, unperformed or unscheduled repairs, and planned maintenance. Critical deferred maintenance covered deferred maintenance projects that place facilities, occupants, or mission at risk.

Interviews with Facilities Management personnel and On-Site Committee observation of the campus physical plant projects provide evidence of implementation of the maintenance needs identified in the report. The On-Site Committee's findings related to CR 2.11.2 reported on how the FAMIS online system is being used by the institution to demonstrate implementation of the daily operational maintenance and repair program that is taking place on an ongoing basis.

- 3.12.1** The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission's substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. *(See the Commission policy "Substantive Changes for Accredited Institutions.")* **(Substantive change)**

The institution provided evidence that it complies in a timely manner with Commission requirements for notification and/or approval of substantive changes with two exceptions. In 2007, the institution failed to notify the Commission prior to offering its first online program but sent through a request for approval the following year along with a copy of a policy and process to ensure that such an oversight did not occur again.

In 2011, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board mandated closure of under-performing programs, and Angelo State did not have the opportunity to notify the Commission prior to suspending admission of new students to the programs identified. The institution subsequently sent the appropriate notification along with details about its plans to ensure that students already enrolled could complete their programs. The Commission acknowledged receipt of the information.

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy compliance)

***3.13.1. “Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies”**

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Documentation: The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

The Off-Site Committee reported that the institution provided the required documentation pertaining to how it represents itself to all agencies that accredit any of its programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents on the accreditation decisions of the following entities recognized by the federal government in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee: NCATE, NASM, NLNAC, CAPTE.

3.13.2 “Collaborative Academic Arrangements: Policy and Procedures”

Applicable Policy Statement. Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy). These arrangements must address the requirements set forth in the collaborative academic arrangements policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC-accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

Documentation: The institution should provide evidence that it has reported to the Commission all collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy) that included signed final copies of the agreements. In addition, the institution should integrate into the Compliance Certification a discussion and determination of compliance with all standards applicable to the provisions of the agreements.

Not applicable

The institution reports that it has no collaborative academic arrangements as affirmed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***3.13.3. “Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions”**

Applicable Policy Statement. Each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized. (See *FR 4.5*). The Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request. This record will be reviewed and evaluated by the Commission as part of the institution's decennial evaluation.

Documentation: When addressing this policy statement, the institution should provide information to the Commission describing how the institution maintains its record and also include the following: (1) individuals/offices responsible for the maintenance of the record(s), (2) elements of a complaint review that are included in the record, and (3) where the record(s) is located (centralized or decentralized). The record itself will be reviewed during the on-site evaluation of the institution.

Students are made aware of complaint policies and procedures through the Student Handbook, ASU Operating Policies and Procedures, the Residence Hall Handbook, the undergraduate and graduate catalogs and the institutional website. Specific information related to grade grievances, violations of the Academic Honor Code or Code of Student Conduct and Procedures Regarding Sexual or Racial Harassment are provided. A general grievance and appeals procedure is available to students for complaints not covered by other published policies or regulations. The grievance procedure has clearly defined steps for students to follow and allows a tiered process for appeals.

The Compliance Report indicates that complaint records are decentralized and maintained in various departments and offices.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed summaries of formal grievances and complaints received. Additionally, members of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee viewed student grievances, faculty responses, department head responses and additional grievance-related correspondence from the deans, all of which were logged electronically in the respective dean's office on campus and provided in printed form for review and as evidence of compliance.

3.13.4. "Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports"

***3.13.4.a. Applicable Policy Statement.** An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification.

Documentation: In order to be in compliance with this policy, the institution must have incorporated an assessment of its compliance with standards that apply to its distance and correspondence education programs and courses.

ASU provides adequate documentation that the *Principles of Accreditation* apply to all programs of the institution, regardless of mode of delivery, with regard to curriculum and instruction, faculty, institutional effectiveness, student services and library and learning resources. However, no evidence was provided with regard to application of *Principles of Accreditation* to distance education in the

areas of facilities and finances (especially in regard to the technology infrastructure necessary to support distance learning).

Information reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee in the Focused Report highlighted the integrated manner in which support for online programs is woven into the fabric of the institution. Supported by HEAF (Higher Education Assistance Funds), the Technology Services Fee and the Distance Education Fee, there appears to be a sustainable funding model for online programs, and to meet the technology, teaching, and staffing needs of these programs. Coupling a sophisticated campus Information Technology and software model with resources available through the Texas State Data Center Services positions ASU very well to maintain its present level of online operations and follow the planning statement in the Centennial Master Plan Update (2011) that a major programmatic goal for the is to: "Provide more spaces for the support of Distance Education curriculum including faculty and IT space" (p.1.9), and the funding and institutional support to maintain or expand Distance Education programs.

3.13.4.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If an institution is part of a system or corporate structure, a description of the system operation (or corporate structure) is submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. The description should be designed to help members of the peer review committees understand the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system and the individual institution's role within that system.

Documentation: The institution should provide a description of the system operation and structure or the corporate structure if this applies.

ASU is an institution in the Texas Tech University System (TTU System). The TTU System was created in 1996, comprising Texas Tech University and the Texas Tech Health Sciences Center. Angelo State University became a member of the TTU System in 2007. The TTU Systems Office provides central management and coordination within the system, including carrying out Board of Regents rules and policies.

ASU is governed by the Board of Regents of the TTU System which is the legal body with specific authority over ASU. The Texas Legislature delegated to the Board of Regents the power and authority to govern, control, and directs the policies of the TTU system and its component institutions. The Board's powers and authority are defined in *The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System*.

Board members are appointed by the governor to six-year terms, with a student appointed to a non-voting one-year term. The Board appoints a Chancellor to carry out the policies of the TTU System. Each member institution is led by a President who is appointed by the chancellor and who serves as the Chief Executive Officer for the respective institution. The reporting structure and duties of all involved are documented and published.

3.13.5. "Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution"

***3.13.5. a. Applicable Policy Statement.** All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.

Documentation: For institutions with branch campuses: (1) The name of each branch campus must include the name of the parent campus—the SACSCOC accredited entity. The institution should provide evidence of this for each of its branch campuses. (2) The institution should incorporate the review of its branch campuses, as well as other extended units under the parent campus, into its comprehensive self-assessment and its determination of compliance with the standards, and indicate the procedure for doing so.

Not applicable

The institution does not have any branch campuses (was affirmed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee).

3.13.5.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If the Commission on Colleges determines that an extended unit is autonomous to the extent that the control over that unit by the parent or its board is significantly impaired, the Commission may direct that the extended unit seek to become a separately accredited institution. A unit which seeks separate accreditation should bear a different name from that of the parent. A unit which is located in a state or country outside the geographic jurisdiction of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and which the Commission determines should be separately accredited or the institution requests to be separately accredited, applies for separate accreditation from the regional accrediting association that accredits colleges in that state or country

Implementation: If, during its review of the institution, the Commission determines that an extended unit is sufficiently autonomous to the extent that the parent campus has little or no control, the Commission will use this policy to recommend separate accreditation of the extended unit. ***No response required by the institution.***

Not applicable

The institution does not have extended units (was affirmed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee).

3.14.1 A member or candidate institution represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. **(Publication of accreditation status)**

Angelo State University represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission as required in the graduate and undergraduate catalog and on the university website.

D. Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements

- *4.1** The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations, student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.
(Student achievement)

As a public institution of higher education in Texas, ASU is required to report institutional performance measures. The institution provided documentation (e.g., General Academic Institutions Performance Measure Definitions, Outcome 16, LBB May 2010 and LBB Actual Performance for Outcomes measures, licensure exam results, job placement) of how it evaluates and ensures that student achievement is consistent with its mission. In addition, performance targets for student achievement are outlined in the Strategic Plan, Vision 2020.

ASU is required to report on institutional performance measures using the Automated Budget Estimate System of Texas (ABEST), which is a web-based application developed by the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) to track requests for appropriations and performance for the Texas Legislature. Biennially, ASU updates or establishes performance targets, which are subject to approval by the LBB. ASU enters actual performance data into the ABEST system. The LBB uses this data to generate a performance report for each fiscal year. Several performance measures related to student achievement are reported in the LBB performance reports, including course completion rates, teacher certification rates, and pass rates on nursing licensure examinations. Other performance measures, such as licensing exams in physical therapy and athletic training, are not subject to LBB reporting requirements but are tracked by the relevant ASU departments. Data from other state agencies are also used to track student achievement, including data from the Texas State Board of Public Accountancy, which tracks pass rates for the Certified Public Accountant exam, and employment data for university graduates tracked by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). Individual ASU departments also maintain data on student achievement as relevant to the given discipline. A summary of key student performance data is provided below.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed these documents and associated data demonstrating that the institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission and with performance targets as set forth in its Strategic Plan. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also interviewed the Director of Institutional Planning, Policy and Effectiveness, the Executive Director of Library Services, the Associate Vice President of Information Technology and CIO, the Assistant Vice President for Research and Accountability, and the Coordinator of Academic Assessment who provided information about how these and other measures of student success are used to improve instruction and institutional performance.

- *4.2** The institution's curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded.
(Program curriculum)

ASU's curricula align with the institutional strategic plan to offer undergraduate and graduate programs that support students' intellectual and personal growth,

address social issues and meet state demands. Further, educational programs, regardless of level or means of delivery, are routinely assessed as part of the campus-wide assessment process. Sample program curricula provide evidence of curricular and mission alignment.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined ASU's program inventory, undergraduate and graduate program learning goals and catalogs, 2020 Vision strategic planning document (2012 update), and the institutional Web site as well as interviewed an academic dean, a faculty member, and the University Registrar. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- *4.3** The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. **(Publication of policies)**

Current academic calendars, grading policies and refund policies are provided in official publications such as the undergraduate and graduate catalogs and on the university website. The ASU refund policy aligns with refund policies defined in the Texas Education Code (TEC 54.006)

ASU makes current operating policies, academic calendars, grading policies and refund policies available to students and other constituents through online publications. Copies of these documents in either printed form, electronic form or both are also provided in evidence.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the aforementioned documents and met with the VP/SAEM and Assistant VP/IRA/ SACS Liaison to verify compliance and continued administrative support and oversight for publication of policies in line with federal requirements. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- *4.4** Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs. **(Program length)**

The institution offers one associate degree which is 60 semester hours in length and is being phased out. The institution's bachelor's degrees range in length from 120 semester hours to 125 hours. Master's programs equal or exceed 30 semester hours. The university catalogs confirm the length of these programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification Report with accompanying documentation and concurs with the compliance determination of the Off-Site Committee.

- *4.5** The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. *(See the Commission policy "Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions.")* **(Student complaints)**

Students are made aware of complaint policies and procedures through the Student Handbook, ASU Operating Policies and Procedures, the Residence Hall Handbook, the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, and the institutional website. Specific information related to grade grievances, violations of the Academic Honor Code or Code of Student Conduct, and Procedures Regarding Sexual or Racial Harassment are provided.

A general grievance and appeals procedure is available to students for complaints not covered by other published policies or regulations. The grievance procedure has clearly defined steps for students to follow and allows a tiered process for appeals. Summaries are provided of how a variety of formal grievances were resolved over the past eight years, and an example of how a grade appeal was handled is included in the Compliance Report.

ASU provides evidence that its policies and procedures governing student complaints are provided, adequate to meet the needs of its students, disseminated, properly followed and recorded.

Summaries of formal grievances and complaints were reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. Additionally, members of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee viewed student grievances, faculty responses, department head responses and additional grievance-related correspondence from the dean, all of which were logged electronically in the respective dean's office on campus and provided in printed form for review and in evidence of compliance.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.6 Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. (Recruitment materials)**

Recruitment materials including the "Discover ASU" brochure, the View Book, the Transfer Guide, and the brochure for international students accurately represent the institution's mission, practices, policies and academic programs. The College of Graduate Studies general brochure describes all graduate programs and gives admission requirements.

The Office of Communications and Marketing oversees all publications, recruitment materials and advertisements. Policies are in place for the approval of advertising and for publication of brochures, pamphlets and other promotional materials. Staff in the Office of Communications and Marketing meets annually with Undergraduate Admissions staff to ensure that recruitment materials are consistent, accurate and reflect current practices and policies regarding admissions, academic programs and facilities.

ASU's recruitment materials in print and electronic format accurately represent the institution's practices, policies, and academic programs. Copies of recruitment materials in the form of brochures are provided as documentation, and procedures for ensuring ongoing accuracy and best practices are provided in the narrative response.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the aforementioned documents and met with the Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and Assistant VPIRA/ SACS Liaison to verify compliance and continued administrative support and oversight for accurate recruitment materials in accordance with federal requirements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- *4.7** The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended. (In reviewing the institution's compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the U.S. Department of Education.) **(Title IV program responsibilities)**

Audit findings have been reported by the State of Texas and the United States Department of Education for FY2009, FY2010 and FY2011, with the university responding and correcting in each year. The university is currently in compliance. The DOE Eligibility and Certification Approval Report confirms eligibility for all aid programs through March, 2015.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents submitted with the compliance report in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

- *4.8** An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following: **(Distance and correspondence education)**

- 4.8.1** demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

ASU requires a unique personal login ID and password to access the Blackboard course management system and other campus systems, including RamPort, the secure campus portal. Users must change their password every 120 days and adhere to strict password standards. Student-faculty interaction in online courses such as synchronous discussions, frequent texting and email exchanges, and use of video are also a critical factor in the ability of faculty to recognize identity discrepancies.

ASU has developed protocols for maintaining security and has established an oversight committee, the Distance Education Council, as well as an ad hoc Distance Education Course Design Committee to monitor and make recommendations on distance education matters.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the institutional Web site, documents that govern student security (OP 4.11 attachments C and D - ASU Distance Education Best Practices and Compliance Form for Distance Education Programs and Courses), IT and Operating and Security Policy, and Security and Management of Protected Information (OP 44.00 and 44.01). ASU does not offer correspondence courses. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

4.8.2 has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.

ASU's policy on distance education, adopted in 2011, states that there is no distinction between programs offered through distance education and those offered on campus and that unless otherwise provided, all policies, standards, and guidelines for on-campus instruction apply to programs delivered via distance education. The institution's operating policy and procedures, OP 44.01 Security and Management of Protected Information, assures the privacy of all student records and information.

ASU does not offer correspondence courses.

ASU has developed protocols for protecting student privacy and ensures that distance students receive the same protection under FERPA as resident students.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the institutional Web site, documents that govern student security (OP 4.11 attachments C and D - ASU Distance Education Best Practices and Compliance Form for Distance Education Programs and Courses), IT and Operating and Security Policy, and Security and Management of Protected Information (OP 44.00 and 44.01) in support of ASU's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

4.8.3 has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.

ASU does not charge additional fees related to verification of the identity of distance education students.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed Web documents and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.9** The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education and to Commission policy. (*See the Commission policy "Credit Hours."*) **(Definition of credit hours)**

The institution determines credit hours for semester courses in a fashion consistent with expectations of the U.S. Department of Education as well as the

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Body. A review of course descriptions in the Academic Catalog provides evidence of the institution's practice being consistent with such policies.

Courses taught in shortened timeframes are expected to have the same number of contact hours as courses taught in a normal semester. Courses taught online must be approved through a formal faculty review process that determines that the course has learning outcomes equivalent to those for a traditionally delivered course.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Institution's Compliance Certification Report with accompanying documentation and concurs with the compliance determination of the Off-Site Committee.

E. Additional Observations regarding strengths and weaknesses of the institution. (optional).

Preliminary Findings

Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

A. Brief description of the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan

Angelo State University's (ASU) Quality Enhancement Plan, *CONNECT! Campus and Community*, creates a framework for Angelo State students, faculty and staff to connect with local, regional, national and global communities to promote service and student learning. This *CONNECT!* initiative is a plan to enhance student learning through community engagement.

The primary student learning focus of the plan is increasing social responsibility among students. This emphasis on social responsibility is in strategic alignment with Angelo State's mission statement and the new elements of the Texas Core Curriculum, a plan to address 21st Century learning outcomes for students at public two- and four-year institutions in Texas. ASU plans to support this objective of enhanced social responsibility through service-learning, internship and community based research activity for students through curricular and co-curricular experiences at ASU.

Angelo State University selected the focus of the QEP after soliciting input and ideas from the campus and community. After meetings, surveys and focus groups generated ideas for the Quality Enhancement Plan, faculty-lead teams narrowed the focus of the QEP proposal. The selection of the QEP topic as increasing student social responsibility will assist ASU in making more broadly available community engagement experiences for students, will increase the likelihood that faculty engage more dynamic pedagogies in the classroom and will further develop ways that intercultural competence and civic responsibility and engagement can be more fully integrated into the ASU curriculum.

Within the *CONNECT!* learning goal of students demonstrating social responsibility (SR), ASU will support the development of SR by promoting three student learning outcomes: students demonstrating intercultural competence, students demonstrating civic responsibility and students demonstrating the ability to engage effectively in the campus, regional, national or global communities.

Through implementing opportunities in the university core curriculum and introductory and majors courses, colleges within ASU will support experiences to develop the social responsibility (SR) student outcomes. Specific SR supporting opportunities will include service-learning courses, internships, community-based research and other opportunities. With a focus on best practices in the literature for effective use of these pedagogies, and with a plan for developing faculty and departmental capacity for employing these teaching and learning strategies, ASU has established an appropriate timeline and implementation plan for this QEP.

Initial *CONNECT!* experiences have been piloted, including service-learning courses and internship opportunities within the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, Health and Human Services and the Freshman College. The *CONNECT!* initiative starts in Year 0 with five Faculty Fellows and five *CONNECT!* experiences and will grow to 35

Faculty Fellows, over 80 *CONNECT!* courses and 15 engaged departments in Year 5 of plan implementation. This development of the *CONNECT!* initiative demonstrates substantive growth of community engaged opportunities, faculty and departments and demonstrates a plan for significant opportunities for student learning in social responsibility through *CONNECT!* experiences.

The assessment strategy for the *CONNECT!* QEP includes formative and summative assessments, performance indicators and direct and indirect measures of student learning in social responsibility.

B. Analysis of the Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan

1. ***An Institutional Process.*** *The institution uses an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.*

The ASU *CONNECT!* QEP was developed after an institutional effort to identify key issues and areas of opportunity for student learning. Specifically, ASU utilized NSSE data, university surveys, benchmarking of other institutions, trends in state and national higher education, Angelo State University strategic priorities and feedback from student learning experts to develop the focus of the *CONNECT!* plan.

Based on information gathered from interviews with ASU senior leadership, the institution feels that engaged learning is already a part of ASU, but that *CONNECT!* will allow Angelo State to build on what they are already doing, as well as focus, document and assess these engaged learning elements.

During the fall 2010 term, the QEP Action Committee led the initial conversations to inform the campus and the community about the QEP, and to solicit suggestions on “*What’s Your BIG Idea?*” to identify the learning needs of ASU students. Assessment information was collected through a review of literature, surveys, and campus and community focus groups to compare with institutional data on student learning and student learning outcomes. The *Essential Learning Outcomes* (AAC&U, 2007), which serves as the basis for the new *Texas Core Curriculum* (2011), were utilized to identify possible core learning objectives for the QEP. **Social Responsibility** was identified as a topic of overlap in the literature review. Institution-level direct and indirect measures of student learning were analyzed, with a comparison for ASU students with the national means. No singular student learning need was identified from the analysis of these data, although ASU students’ mean scores for several areas were lower than the national mean. Results of the 2009 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) identified 12 areas significantly lower for ASU students than the national means. This set of comprehensive assessment information was compiled, evaluated, and analyzed.

In November, 2010, the reports and results of the needs assessment were shared with the campus and community in a town-hall meeting, through the media, and on the QEP website. Faculty-led teams were established in a *Call for QEP Topic Proposals*, and selected abstracts were developed further for evaluation. In March, 2011, the topic proposal abstracts were identified, with six proposals selected for public review and comments. The topic proposal list was narrowed to five, and this list was reviewed by the QEP Topics Proposal Review Subcommittee that

recommended *Community-Engaged Active Learning* as the topic for ASU's QEP. This recommendation was fully approved by the appropriate QEP leadership groups, and in May, 2011, the topic of *CONNECT!* was publically announced as the **BIG** Idea for ASU's QEP.

2. **Focus of the Plan.** *The institution identifies a significant issue that (1) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and (2) accomplishes the mission of the institution.*

The QEP has identified a student learning goal that students will demonstrate social responsibility as a result of experiences in the *CONNECT!* initiative. This learning goal aligns with the institutional mission of Angelo State University. The University mission statement is as follows: "Angelo State University, a member of the Texas Tech University System, delivers undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts, sciences and professional disciplines in a learning-centered environment distinguished by its integration of teaching, research, creative endeavor, service and co-curricular experiences. ASU prepares students to be responsive citizens and to have productive careers." The institutional focus on integrative teaching, research and service, along with the support co-curricular experiences to develop civic responsibility among ASU students, appropriately aligns the ASU mission with the *CONNECT!* initiative.

The QEP document reflects that the *CONNECT!* initiative is effectively aligned with not only the Angelo State mission statement and values, but also with the Texas Tech University System priorities of student success, academic quality and increasing outreach and engagement, and with Angelo State undergraduate learning goals of social responsibility and intercultural awareness.

3. **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** *The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.*

The *CONNECT!* QEP reflects consideration of appropriate university resources to implement this QEP initiative. The establishment of the Center for Community Engagement is a key capacity building piece for the *CONNECT!* initiative, and the Center will serve as a clearinghouse for *CONNECT!* partnership and project opportunities, along with supporting faculty development, providing oversight to the development of *CONNECT!* experiences and supporting the Faculty Fellows component of the *CONNECT!* plan. The initial piloting of *CONNECT!* experiences demonstrates faculty buy-in and participation, along with connection between the *CONNECT!* initiative and the ASU curriculum. Based on interviews with the QEP Director and members of the QEP development and QEP implementation committees, ASU will repeat piloted *CONNECT!* courses and internships in future semesters as the continued implementation of the *CONNECT!* plan.

Based on the QEP document and information from interviews with ASU President, Provost and VP of Finance, there is evidence of adequate financial support from the university for salary for staff in the Center for Community Engagement, along with adequate support for *CONNECT!* plan operations, marketing and communication, Faculty Fellows support and other faculty development resources. Based on

information from these interviews and the *CONNECT!* document, there appears to be adequate support from ASU Deans and Department Chairs for this initiative.

Capacity for the *CONNECT!* plan is further supported by collaboration with the ASU Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR) and the office of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Based on information gathered in interviews with the QEP Director, the ASU President, Provost and Faculty Fellows, the CITR will serve as a professional development resource for faculty in the *CONNECT!* initiative. Collaboration with Student Affairs will allow for the development of future co-curricular *CONNECT!* experiences and can serve as a resource in identifying potential community partners for the *CONNECT!* plan.

Based on information gathered in interviews with the ASU Executive Director of Information Technology, the institution plans to leverage existing systems of student recordkeeping and information technology to provide capacity for these elements of the *CONNECT!* plan and to minimize additional administrative costs for these recording and reporting components of the QEP. Additionally, based on information gathered in interviews, the ASU President has communicated that the *CONNECT!* initiative is a priority for funding in future year budgets.

Additional state appropriations are anticipated in fiscal year 2014 that will be allocated to fund the *CONNECT!* budget through the Center for Community Engagement. Should state appropriations not be made available for this initiative, the institution shared plans to reallocate funding from the Instructional Enhancement Fee (currently \$10/credit hour) to the Center for Community Engagement to support the *CONNECT!* initiative. Other potential funding sources for *CONNECT!*, professional development needs were identified, including the Distance Learning Fee and Hispanic Student Initiative STEM funds.

4. **Broad-based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies.** *The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.*

The formation of *CONNECT!* reflects input and ideas from a variety of campus and community constituents from students to alumni to faculty and administration to community groups. Campus surveys of students, faculty and staff were utilized to gather information on the potential focus of the QEP. Additionally, feedback was requested from a variety of community members, through focus groups, and this input was utilized in the development of *CONNECT!*.

Faculty-led teams were also utilized to narrow the focus of the plan and to develop the proposal for the QEP. Based on interviews with the Community Engagement Advisory Board, it was stated that students were also involved in selecting the focus of the QEP through feedback provided in surveys and in participation on the QEP Development committee. Utilizing diverse perspectives to inform the development of the plan increases the likelihood of engagement in the QEP from all parties and increases the potential of sustainability of this initiative.

5. **Assessment of the Plan.** *The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals.*

The QEP has identified a student learning goal that students will demonstrate social responsibility as a result of experiences in the CONNECT! initiative. The ASU QEP has an assessment strategy that will directly measure three student learning outcomes related to the learning goal of social responsibility. These learning outcomes include student demonstration of intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility and the ability to engage effectively in the community.

The QEP reflects a connection between the QEP topic and the design of the assessment protocols based on an extensive needs assessment and review of relevant literature and research related to the goals of the QEP, including the use of benchmarking with other institutions embarking on similar endeavors, and modeling of best practices in both pedagogy and assessment.

The institution is employing a simple “bridge model” in its approach to assessment of the QEP, identifying where ASU is currently, the intervention to be used, and where they hope to be following that intervention. In terms of “where they are now”, the institution has conducted an audit of current practices related to student engagement activities and social responsibility, and have conducted preliminary assessments that clearly show that students are not performing at acceptable levels in this area. They have identified a clear “bridge”, involvement of students in the activities outlined in the QEP, and have identified sound, rigorous measurement tools to gauge where students are in the future on these learning outcomes, after having experienced the enhanced learning environment promised by the QEP.

The QEP assessment strategy includes formative and summative assessment and direct and indirect measures of student learning. Student learning will be evaluated based on student work products assessed with the social responsibility rubric, student surveys and community partner evaluation of student performance on CONNECT! projects.

The current assessment tools include a rubric that allows faculty fellows and community partners to assess each of the six sub-goals across the assessment cycle, with clear benchmarks established for each year of the implementation. In addition to the rubric used as a direct measure of student learning, indirect measures include a survey completed by community partners rating student learning on each of the target goals, and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), with primary focus on 10 survey items directly related to the goals of the QEP. A pilot implementation of the QEP employed use of the rubric and the CONNECT survey and provided documentation that these tools can be used effectively to measure the extent to which students have achieved the goals.

C. Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP

The *CONNECT! Campus and Community* plan appropriately builds on ASU's history of service in the region and seems especially responsive to an increase in diversity in the ASU student body. Particularly critical to the success of the *CONNECT!* plan is the establishment of and connection to the Center for Community Engagement. The

existence of this centralized operating unit to support programing, partnerships and professional development in the *CONNECT!* initiative will provide a foundation for success for this program.

The *CONNECT!* plan and those involved in the QEP development process also intend to leverage their work on this initiative to develop their application for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Connecting the QEP to other campus activities and priorities, such as the Carnegie Classification, further helps the QEP initiative fully integrate into the campus culture.

The Faculty Fellows component of the *CONNECT!* plan is a strength of this initiative. Faculty Fellows fill a number of roles including serving as early adopters of *CONNECT!* opportunities and Fellows serve as mentors for other faculty who will develop future *CONNECT!* experiences. The Faculty Fellows opportunity will provide a mechanism for faculty to participate in the *CONNECT!* initiative and receive professional development and support. Faculty Fellows also contribute to institutional know-how in developing effective community engagement efforts.

An additional strength of the *CONNECT!* initiative is the intentional connection between the learning outcomes of the QEP, the anticipated revisions to the core curriculum and the institutional and system missions.

Based on interviews with the Community Engagement Advisory Board members, it was stated that ASU will maintain enthusiasm for the *CONNECT!* initiative through *change* management, strategic planning, identifying new *CONNECT!* champions, university leadership and awareness, student energy and the support of community members for the plan. Considering these elements for sustaining momentum for the *CONNECT!* initiatives early on in the implementation of the plan is an additional strength of this proposal.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee offers the following observations on the Angelo State Quality Enhancement Plan:

1. In regard to assessment, the institution might benefit from not only comparison with NSSE data on national benchmarks, but also from institutional improvement on baseline NSSE scores over time rather than comparison with other institutions exclusively. The institution might consider locally administering the NSSE survey.
2. In order to increase the utility of community partner evaluations of student learning, the *CONNECT!* initiative could provide training and support to community partners in strategies for effective evaluation of student work.
3. The institution's pilot assessment of the QEP found that administrative workload, including assessment, was very time consuming and produced an increased burden on *CONNECT!* Faculty Fellows. The institution could benefit from additional functionality in the ASU Blackboard system to make the process more efficient. Support provided by the ASU Center for Community Engagement in collecting, interpreting, analyzing and disseminating assessment results will prevent undue pressure on the Academic Assessment Office and college assessment coordinators.

4. The appointment of a Director of Community Partnerships currently budgeted within the ASU Center for Community Engagement could enhance the appropriate expansion of *CONNECT!* partnerships and community engagement relationships for this initiative. This Director position is a key resource for the cultivation of partners for the effective growth of the *CONNECT!* plan.
5. The *CONNECT!* plan would benefit from a focused and structured approach to faculty, staff and community partner development to build a shared understanding of such things as: social responsibility, client relationships, experiential learning pedagogies and assessment of learning outcomes.
6. Within the assessment plan, it is unclear if there is an intentional plan for continuous quality improvement of program processes for the *CONNECT!*

Part IV. Third-Party Comments

If an institution receives Third-Party Comments, the institution has an opportunity to respond to those comments and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the response as part of its comprehensive evaluation of the institution.

No Third-Party Comments submitted.

APPENDIX A

Roster of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

Dr. Suzanne Ozment – Chair
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs
University of Montevallo
Montevallo, AL

Dr. Jeanette M. Barker
Director of Institutional Effectiveness
North Carolina Central University
Durham, NC

Dr. Sharon I. Bevins
Chair, Department of Physical Therapy
and Human Performance
Florida Gulf Coast University
Fort Myers, FL

Dr. Sherryl A. Byrd
Vice President, Student Affairs
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, TN

Dr. Joe G. Delap
Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, AL

Mrs. Virginia R. Kinman
Electronic Resources Librarian, Professor,
and Director of SACS Compliance
Longwood University
Farmville, VA

Mr. Charles A. Maimone
Vice Chancellor Business Affairs
University of North Carolina - Wilmington
Wilmington, NC

Dr. Robert J. Sheehan
Provost and Senior Vice President
for Academics and Student Affairs
Coastal Carolina University
Conway, SC

Dr. Charles D. Whitlock
President
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY

COC Staff Coordinator
Dr. Mark V. Smith
Vice President
Decatur, GA

Roster of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee

Dr. Rebecca I. Porterfield - Chair
Associate Dean, Director of Assessment, and
International Programs
Univ of North Carolina - Wilmington
Wilmington, NC

Dr. Carol Burton
Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC

Dr. John M. Delaney
Vice Chancellor for Student Development
The Univ. of Tenn. at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, TN

Dr. Joe G. Delap
Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, AL

Dr. Randy J. Dunn
President
Murray State University
Murray, KY

Dr. Ricky L. Slavings
Professor Emeritus
Radford University
Radford, VA

Dr. Susan E. Stephenson
Vice President for Business, Finance, and
Facilities (CFO)
The University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL

Ms. Christin Shatzer, QEP Lead Evaluator
Director of Service-Learning
Lipscomb University
Nashville, TN

COC STAFF Coordinator
Dr. Mark V. Smith
Vice President
Decatur, GA

APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed

ASU does not have Off-Campus Sites.

Preliminary Findings

APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee

CS 3.2.8 (Qualified Administrative/Academic Officers) Recommendation 1.
The Committee recommends that the institution have qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution.

Preliminary Findings