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I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit
The purpose of this visit was for a comprehensive renewal of institutional accreditation. No changes were requested for this visit. For some institutional plans that would require changes, the team confirmed in interviews that appropriate procedures and communication with the Commission are already underway.

B. Institutional Context
Arkansas State University-Jonesboro is an institution with its roots in secondary vocational (farm and homemaking) education in the early part of the 20th century. Its regional service area is the “Delta” region, which in Arkansas refers to the area to the west of the Mississippi River forming the eastern border of Arkansas. This is an agricultural and economically depressed region.

In 1933 it became a College and in 1967, a University. In the 1990s, satellite campuses were established, and in 2006, they and the Jonesboro site became a “system” with a President; the CEO of ASU-Jonesboro is a Chancellor.

Prior to the inauguration of the present Chancellor, Dr. Hudson, in May of 2012, the institution experienced 2 interim Chancellors and some other senior level vacancies and replacements. During the last 3 years, 6 of the 9 deans are new.

ASU-Jonesboro has approximately 10,000 undergraduate and 3,000 graduate students and awards associates, bachelors, masters, professional doctorates, and research doctorates; most graduates are in nursing, business, and education. Graduate programs in education, large-scale web-based programs, confer over 1,000 degrees each year.

On-campus housing has recently increased significantly. Most undergraduates are full time and taking in-person courses; most graduate students are part-time and taking online courses, although there are undergraduate online and graduate in-person programs.

C. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit
None.

D. Additional Locations or Branch Campuses Visited (if applicable)
None

E. Distance Delivery Reviewed
The team reviewed ASU-Jonesboro’s two main venues for distance education. One is termed “large-scale distance delivery” and consists of very large classes (300-1,000) students organized by one responsible faculty member assisted with graders. The other consists of online sections that are similar in size and outcomes to on-campus classes. The team reviewed course syllabi and materials, and interviewed both faculty and students across a diverse range of programs. Currently the institution is authorized to offer 100% of its programs via distance delivery.
II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process

ASU-Jonesboro began its self-study process under the previous criteria. The process began in 2010 under the previous chancellor, and was concluded this year. From the self-study document itself and interviews, it is clear that the process was thorough and inclusive. Academic and support units were treated with an equal attention to assessment and examination of the mission and goals of the university.

While on site, the team noted the large numbers of participants in various meetings. Not only for the open staff and faculty meetings, but in meetings called for online faculty, new faculty, adjunct faculty, graduate students, doctoral students, undergraduate students, employers and internship site representatives, participation was large, informed and enthusiastic. It is clear that the institution cast a wide and open invitation, which speaks to very open, transparent and well-communicated process.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

Both the report and the on-site team experience showed exceptional clarity and openness. ASU personnel were clearly used to operating in a ‘sunshine’ publicly-available mode, and it was evident that voices were heard and report analysis was inclusive.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

The 2003 comprehensive visit resulted in recommendations for follow-up in 3 areas: assessment, strategic planning, and shared governance.

- A focused visit in 2008 on strategic governance and strategic planning followed, and found the institution in compliance with no more follow-up recommended.
  - The present team interviewed people extensively on the issues of planning and shared governance.
  - Particularly with new administrators over the last 2 years, there has been a significant revival of shared governance activities, such as the attendance of staff, faculty and student representation on the chancellor’s executive committee. People spoke of extensive involvement and numerous committees.

The process of finding the best shared governance structure, and of developing clarity in terms of which issues are appropriate for consultation and for decision-making by various entities proceeds.

The current strategic plan is dated 2010-2015. Both the top-level initiatives (areas) and listings of specific actions and their outcomes are available online although not entirely easily. Many interviewees were familiar with broad themes (e.g. globalization) but few mentioned specific actions or plan orientations.

ASU participated in the Assessment Academy beginning in 2007. Its progress in the Academy had problems. Currently, an assessment ideology has progressed thoroughly. New staffing (Director of Assessment) supports the institution’s goals of pervasive and effective assessment. People in many areas and at many levels (including President and Provost) spoke of the need for assessment, and the use of data. More progress is needed to bring the technical structures up to best-practices standards.
The conversation about ‘research’ on campus appeared primarily if not exclusively to be about disciplinary/discovery research; very few faculty mentioned scholarship of teaching, and/or taking assessment data into published/peer-reviewed venues.

ASU changed its Indian mascot to a Red Wolf. This new iconography was pervasive on campus and in the community and appears to have been a very successful transition.

The following items were discussed in the 2003 report without occasioning formal follow-up:

- The relation of the mission to the growth of doctoral programs and the Biosciences Institute.
  Interviewees spoke of the growth of the research identity of the campus, and the opportunities afforded by the Arkansas Biosciences Institute.
- Higher administration vacancies and turnover
  Current administration seems to have stabilized.
- Older buildings
  Some building renovations and replacements have been accomplished. Tours of buildings showed a range of acceptable to extraordinarily good facilities.
- Rising tuition
  This continues to be a concern for all public institutions and students, no more so than anywhere else.
- Gaps in communication
  Interviewees said that considerable progress had been made, although it was still a work in progress (as in many institutions).
- Flat Library budget during period of addition of graduate programs
  A per-credit library fee has been added which has allowed the library to provide needed resources.
- Diversity among faculty and staff
  See below. Diversity among faculty and staff continues to need attention, while diversity among students has become more of a problem due to more-strict admission requirements.
- Faculty load including needed revision of the Handbook
  A new faculty handbook has been developed; the practical application of load language remains a work in progress but the institution has devoted significant time to the issue.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

One comment was received through third-party comment. The institution clearly communicated the accreditation process to its constituencies.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

ASU-Jonesboro is in compliance with federal requirements. See worksheet in Appendix C.

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

CRITERION ONE: MISSION. The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

Core Component 1A: The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.
Subcomponent 1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.

Subcomponent 2. The institution’s academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

Subcomponent 3. The institution’s planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

Team Determination:  
_x_ Core Component is met  
___ Core Component is met with concerns  
___ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
As evidenced by interviews with several university groups during the team’s visit, there is broad understanding of the mission among the institution’s constituencies. The current mission was revised as part of the university’s strategic planning process and is clear and precise by using the e3 logo. Team members were impressed with the fact that many students were able to articulate the three terms of the mission (educates, enhances, enriches). The institution is committed to following a formal and collaborative process, similar to its planning process, through which its mission was reviewed, modified, and approved by the Board of Trustees in 2010.

The mission indicates that the university offers programs from the associate to doctoral levels and that remains accurate. There is a typical infrastructure of services available to students. The academic support services are the primary responsibilities of Academic Affairs and the personal and non-academic support systems are provided by Student Affairs. The team was impressed with the breadth and depth of student services that is available to students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The institution is particularly committed to assisting students with special needs and maybe at risk.

As a public university, Arkansas State’s enrollment profile is representative of the state (77 percent Arkansas residents); yet, it is nationally and internationally diverse (17 percent enrollment from other U.S. states and territories; 6 percent enrollment from at least 60 countries). This enrollment profile is supportive of the mission, role and scope, and vision of the university. The fall 2012 entering class was the best-prepared class in Arkansas State’s history with an average ACT composite score of 22.9 and an average high school GPA of 3.37. Arkansas State’s ACT average exceeded that of the nation (21.1) and state (20.3). This reflects the implementation of the new admissions standards for unconditional admission.

ASU publications (catalog, marketing materials, departmental and divisional goals, etc.) provide evidence that the mission is integral to university operations. Board of Trustee members, Staff Senate leaders, faculty, and student leaders demonstrated to the team that they have a working knowledge of the mission and core values. The mission statement and its complementary core values and strategies are seen as guidelines to continuing fulfillment of ASU’s purposes.

Core Component 1B: The mission is articulated publicly.

Subcomponent 1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
Subcomponent 2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

Subcomponent 3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Team Determination:  
_x_ Core Component is met  
__ Core Component is met with concerns  
__ Core Component is not met  

Evidence:  
Arkansas State’s mission and its e3 logo are articulated publicly through its website, stationery, business cards, and other means. The mission is referenced in presentations and other venues by Arkansas State administration, faculty, and staff. Unit mission statements are aligned with the institution’s mission statement. Arkansas State’s mission statement is coupled with the university’s core values and vision and is publicly available on the university website and in documents such as the Undergraduate Bulletin, Graduate Catalog, Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook, other college handbooks, commencement programs, and other documents as appropriate. The mission, core values, and vision are expanded upon by the Strategic Priorities and Goals.

The mission, vision, and core values are easily found in the many publications as well as in the handbooks for faculty, staff, and students. The various aspects of Arkansas State’s mission are best reflected in the institution’s Strategic Planning Priorities and Goals which are the product of Arkansas State’s most recent strategic planning process.

The Role and Scope of Arkansas State University, one of the university’s mission documents, describes and identifies the university’s authority as a grantor of Associate, Baccalaureate, Masters, and Doctoral programs appropriate for a comprehensive university.

Core Component 1C: The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

Subcomponent 1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.

Subcomponent 2. The institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Team Determination:  
_x_ Core Component is met  
__ Core Component is met with concerns  
__ Core Component is not met  

Evidence:  
Arkansas State fulfills this role through its academic offerings, recruitment of students, faculty, and staff, campus activities, and community interactions. One of Arkansas State’s Strategic Planning Priorities is to Increase diversity and expand globalization. The central theme and purpose of this goal is to prepare students for global citizenship; develop a service environment that supports the needs of a diverse Arkansas State community; and
attract, employ, retain and advance greater numbers of university faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. The minority student profile reflects 20 percent of the undergraduate and 18 percent of the graduate student populations.

The self-study indicates that the university has made the principle of an “inclusive university” a “cornerstone” of the strategic plan. The university has developed a definition of diversity that is inclusive of the various groups that make up the university’s employee and student community. Further, other policies of the university make clear that, regardless of what individual differences are represented within the ASU community, those various groups can learn and grow in an environment of safety and nurturing. In addition, the university is making an attempt to recruit a more diverse pool of applicants for its positions.

Currently, the University lags in achieving an ethnically and gender-diverse faculty and senior-level staff (lower-level staff is more diverse). Interviewees noted that Arkansas State is committed to improving the diversity of its faculty and staff. It has recently filled the position of the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) with an interim appointment. Once this position becomes permanent, the institution should develop an effective plan with goals and actions.

The university provided numerous examples of responsive programs in its self-study. Throughout the visit, the team met with representatives from some of the new initiatives, and it was clear that there are many passionate advocates for student success from both the academic and student affairs areas of the university. The Multi-Cultural Center provides educational, cultural and social programs, and initiatives that support student success for all students with specific concentration on minority and underrepresented student populations. The University is committed to sustain an inclusive campus environment that promotes value and respect for all members of the ASU community. As part of its strategic planning, ASU has committed itself to go global: “Bring the World to ASU, Take ASU to the World.”

Core Component 1D: The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

Subcomponent 1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.

Subcomponent 2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

Subcomponent 3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Team Determination:  
_x_ Core Component is met  
__ Core Component is met with concerns  
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
The team reviewed numerous examples of meeting the public good. For example, the Arkansas State University Museum serves the academic mission of the university as a teaching museum. It provides quality programming that broadens the perceptions of people in Northeast Arkansas and the Mississippi River Delta region by connecting people with their history, promoting tolerance, engaging minds in progressive thinking, and enhancing the sense of community among all audiences. The Diabetes Self-Management Program is a
free outpatient clinic providing services to ASU faculty, families, and students. Regional Center for Disaster Preparedness Education is the only accredited provider of the Core, Basic, and Advanced Disaster Life Support courses in the state of Arkansas. These courses provide education and training in natural disasters as well as biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear, and explosive events.

In addition to the services and outreach provided through the College of Fine Arts’ (CFA) fabulous performance facilities, the college hosts various competitions for area music students, provides summer choir and piano camps, and private vocal and instrumental lessons for the community. CFA also partners with the magnet elementary school for the Performing Arts and other area schools. The Summer Children’s Theatre is a tradition for families and children of all ages. The Delta Blues Symposium, hosted annually by the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS), Department of English and Philosophy, is attended by individuals from across the globe.

University College (UC) reaches out to pre-college students through its Upward Bound program that provides both school year and summer programming to better prepare students for college success. Continuing Education and Community Outreach (CECO) coordinates concurrent enrollment with the area high schools, offers community education programs and professional development opportunities for businesses and individuals, sponsors Saturday and summer camps for youth, and offers numerous other community outreach based activities. Each academic college has an external advisory board, as do some specific degree programs. These groups provide valuable guidance, to faculty and academic administrators, in the development and updating of curricular offerings and involve external constituents in a substantive manner in defining the learning outcomes and skill sets that students need to master before graduation.

The university has a strong relationship with the Jonesboro Regional Chamber of Commerce and its members. Executive officers, academic deans, and other university representatives are members of the Chamber and participate in its many events and activities throughout the year. This involvement keeps Arkansas State informed of community growth and development while allowing the university to provide support and leadership to community initiatives. Each of the academic Colleges are integrally connected with the community in substantial and significant ways resulting in ASU benefitting from community involvement and the University contributing to the vitality of the region.

Members of the regional community spoke highly of the Institution’s commitment, contribution, and economic force in the area of “town-gown” relations. The University is one of the largest employers as well as its significant contribution to the work force. Many, if not all, of the employers who have hired ASU grads praised the talent, skills, and preparedness of the graduates as well as interns that were eventually hired into full-time positions. Employers spoke highly of the contributions of ASU to the region and valued the role of faculty, staff and students in enriching the community.

**Team Determination on Criterion One:**

- **_x_** Criterion is met
- **___** Criterion is met with concerns
- **___** Criterion is not met
Summary Statement on Criterion:
As evidenced by interviews with several university groups during the team’s visit, there is broad understanding of the mission among the institution’s constituencies. The institution is committed to following a formal and collaborative process, similar to its planning process, through which its mission is reviewed, modified, and approved. Arkansas State’s mission, including its vision and values, continues to guide the university. The core values and strategic plan serve to strengthen and focus on the mission. Student and campus support services are widely encompassing of students’ needs and are highlighted by unique services. Arkansas State enjoys a rich, positive, “town-gown” relationship with its surrounding area and is particularly proud of its many existing and evolving service learning opportunities and volunteer activities. The University reaches out to its community to involve stakeholders in advisory committees for its programs, for input into its physical community, and through its service learning and other programs that compel students, faculty, and staff to volunteer in the local community in many different organizations. The university takes pride in its contributions to economic enrichment.

The University is deeply committed to a diverse community, as demonstrated by the many programs, activities and events, ranging from small group discussions to global programming. Both staff and students spoke highly of the efforts of The Multicultural Student Center in its fostering and promoting an appreciation for the richness of a diverse community. The students expressed an appreciation for the support and a sense of community at the Center.

The university will benefit from recruiting and retaining talented faculty and senior staff including at the Board level. The governor appoints the Board members and current Board members do not control or advise about the appointments; all five current Board members are white males. If ASU is to move forward in this arena it will benefit putting in place an experienced and capable Diversity Officer who is positioned appropriately in the administrative organization. The current interim Diversity Officer reports to the VP for Finance, which is not the usual reporting line for such a role.

CRITERION TWO: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct. The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Component 2A: The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Team Determination:  _x_ Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
Various Arkansas State University handbooks, policy, and operating manuals provide guidance for its constituency groups: the Board of Trustees governance, the Shared Governance process, the Complaint and Grievance Processes, the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and the System Staff Handbook. There are established processes for reporting abuse or fraud and the behaviors that may result in disciplinary action are clearly outlined.
According to Acts 1163 and 742 of the State of Arkansas, the university follows a system of open records for most financial transactions and regulates all procurement services. Fiscal operations adhere state and university policies, procedures, and best practices to ensure ethical and responsible behavior. The Office of Finance has established the Office of Compliance and Process Improvement to assist the division in ensuring compliance. On its website and handbooks, Arkansas State University articulates its commitment to non-discrimination and equal opportunity for all applicants and members of its student body, faculty and staff. Human Resources has established procedures to ensure fair and ethical practices with regard to employee groups. The university provides information and training on hiring procedures, employee evaluation, disciplinary action, and employee benefits. The Faculty Handbook provides detailed explanation of the promotion, retention, and tenure process although minimum standards for promotion and tenure are established at university, college, and department levels. State law dictates a post-tenure review process.

The Office of Affirmative Action provides clear information on its website in regards to its oversight of compliance with state and federal laws related to Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity, Title IX, and Non-Discrimination. Disability Services ensures equal access to programs, classes, and services in compliance with the American Disabilities Act.

The office of the Registrar ensures the integrity of academic records and associated processes and has web links to its various services. The Office of Admissions and Student records monitors and evaluates academic procedures and provides training for faculty, staff, and students. Auxiliary operations are subject to the same ethical policies and processes.

The evidence described demonstrates that Arkansas State University has appropriate systems in place to ensure integrity across its divisions and functions. The policies and expectations related to ethical behavior and transparency for its various constituencies are clearly defined and designed to ensure compliance.

Core Component 2B: The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Team Determination: ___ Core Component is met
_x_ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
The university website was redesigned in 2013 to serve as the primary information provider to students, faculty, staff and the public. The current home page has a modern look with clear and well organized categories. There are quick links to the most frequently accessed information and there are quick links to information for future and current students, parents, faculty & staff, alumni and the community although various meetings with students showed frustration in finding information on the university website. The ASU 2012-2013 Factbook, easily found from the home page, offers well organized data and information on its organization, academic programs, students, employees, and resources.

Ongoing usability studies would be helpful in tweaking the website to be fully functional for today’s generation of students, both the web-savvy and those new to higher education.
2+2 and other articulation agreements are not readily discoverable. Students interviewed said that they were confused about articulation options, and institution staff, when asked, stated that this information was available upon a student’s initiative in contacting staff at cooperating institutions. Team members were unable to locate program-level (vs. individual-course) transfer practices in the Bulletin or in the webpage. Also, some program-specific licensure pass rates are not readily posted on university or program pages (See 7c of the Assumed Practices).

Accreditations, including HLC and 25 discipline specific accreditations, are found easily from the home page following the link “About ASU” and also at the beginning of the undergraduate and graduate bulletins.

During the site visit, multiple doctoral students stated that in some programs, requirements are changed and imposed on students who are already in the program. Better guidelines for changing and then implementing program requirements would be desirable.

Arkansas State University understands the importance of its website as the main avenue of communication with all of its constituencies in today’s technology rich world and has recently redesigned it for functionality.

Core Component 2C: The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

  Subcomponent 1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

  Subcomponent 2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

  Subcomponent 3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

  Subcomponent 4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Team Determination: _x_ Core Component is met
___ Core Component is met with concerns
___ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
The ASU Board of Trustees website provides access to its Calendar, Meeting Minutes and Resolutions, Bylaws, Principles of Board Service, and Standards of Conduct. The information posted publicly on the BOT website shows evidence of the Board’s focus on advancing all aspects of the Arkansas State University System in the best interest of the constituencies served.

The minutes of the BOT deliberations show review and consideration of relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies. Examples include resolutions approving
changes to amend the Faculty Handbook, approving the list of programs designated as not eligible for tuition discount, or approving redirection of the library fee revenues.

The Bylaws, Principles of Board Service, and Standards of Conduct documents clearly determine that the Board of Trustees, established by statute, operates independently in accordance with high standards and avoiding issues of conflict of interest.

The BOT bylaws gives the President the authority to run ASU System and each campus is run by a Chancellor who reports to the President. The Chancellor is the chief executive officer of the university and has the authority to administer overall campus affairs. The foreword of the Faculty Handbook recognizes that “the faculty has responsibility for policy development in such fundamental areas as curriculum, research, scholarship, creative activities, faculty service, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.” The Faculty Handbook also recognizes that “the administration retains all its prerogatives of academic and fiscal management and that the Board of Trustees retains all its prerogatives of constitutional and statutory governance.”

The evidence presented through the information readily available on the Board of Trustees and the ASU websites show that the governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to carry its mission and determine its strategic plan. The ASU Board of Trustees, appointed by the governor, operates under bylaws that give the Board the authority for the entire management and control of the activities, affairs, operations, business, and property of the Arkansas State University System.

**Core Component 2D:** The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

**Team Determination:**

- [x] Core Component is met
- [ ] Core Component is met with concerns
- [ ] Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**
The ASU System Policy on Freedom of Expression clearly states “the Arkansas State University System recognizes and protects the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of expression, and the right to assemble peaceably.” The Faculty Handbook reflects and expands on the values of freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth. The Student Handbook outlines the academic rights and responsibilities of the student and establishes that students may exercise freedom of speech and expression through the campus newspaper or other media and through participation in student governance. Students and faculty at various meetings during this visit confirmed that they operate with freedom of expression and in pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

**Core Component 2E:** The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

**Subcomponent 2.** Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.
Team Determination:  _x_  Core Component is met
                  ___ Core Component is met with concerns
                  ___ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
ASU places great importance in the research activity of its faculty and the Faculty Handbook states “the Arkansas State University System will act vigorously to discourage and detect misconduct in research [and] will take appropriate disciplinary action against any of its employees or students who engage in such misconduct.” The ASU System Policy on Misconduct in Research identifies steps to address any instance of research misconduct. The Research Compliance Officer, within the Office of Research and Technology Transfer, is responsible for ensuring that all research is carried out in a responsible manner following federal and state laws. In accordance and alignment with System policies, the university has policies covering Research Misconduct, Intellectual Property, Patents, Research Compliance, and Conflict of Interest. Discussion continues between the Faculty Senate and Administration about updating the Intellectual Property and Patent policies.

The university has in place the Appropriate Use of Information & Technology Resources Policy as well as a computing Acceptable Use Policy published on its website. All students must acknowledge the Acceptable Use Policy before applying for and ASU network ID. These regulations apply to any individual accessing the ASU technology infrastructure and address copyright, computer ethics and network ID validity. Each semester, librarians teach several sessions of an introductory course on using electronic information sources and the library provides links to style manuals to assist students with avoiding plagiarism. Faculty documented how various courses offer students guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

Arkansas State University promotes academic integrity and professional ethics among all members of its community. A mandatory First Year Seminar discusses university policies on academic integrity and academic misconduct and the Student Handbook provides information on academic misconduct, including plagiarism, cheating, and appropriate discipline and sanctions. The Office of Student Conduct is responsible for addressing issues of student behavior and misconduct and also provides proactive programming for classes and organizations to educate students on appropriate behavior.

Several online programs use web-cam/ monitored testing. The largest-enrollment program, Education, relies on password protection and assessment by project rather than tests. As technology development continues, the institution needs to use best practices to ensure student identity for online coursework.

Team Determination on Criterion Two:  _x_  Criterion is met
                                          ___ Criterion is met with concerns
                                          ___ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:
Integrity is one of the six core values approved by the Board of Trustees and identified as central to the success of Arkansas State University: “we hold high standards of character and integrity as the foundations upon which the university is built.” The Arkansas State University System mission, vision, and values are clearly stated at the beginning of the Faculty Handbook and the System Staff Handbook, as well as in many other university documents. Through multiple audits, accreditations, and internal and external reviews, ASU has established an effective system of checks and balances to ensure that integrity is paramount and the base of its financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions.

CRITERION THREE: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support. The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Component 3A: The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

Subcomponent 1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Team Determination:  _x_ Core Component is met
  ___ Core Component is met with concerns
  ___ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
A wide variety of indicators provide evidence of the currency and performance level at ASU, including the many accredited programs, the program review process, employer and internship supervisors satisfaction, and equipment across a variety of programs, which is often extensive and quite up-to-date.

ASU offers courses in multiple formats and in many locations. Program quality and consistency are the responsibility of colleges and departments. Syllabi are required to list common student learning outcomes and common assessments across courses taught at the degree program or general education level.

Given their multiple formats and locations, ASU needs to be sure that program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations.

For example, at http://www.astate.edu/a/hlc/resources/_files/_chapter-three/Sample-Course-Assessment-from-All-Locations.pdf there is the statement that “According to the assessment report courses taught as concurrent enrollment in the high schools, at the Paragould site or online were not included in the assessment.” ASU offers many dual-credit sections for high school students. They have robust ‘input’ quality control, e.g. control of syllabus, textbooks, and teacher qualifications and training. They have not integrated learning outcomes.
assessment, but this should be an easy next step, given the relatively strong structure for undergraduate assessment.

ASU has many online courses that have 'normal' section sizes, normal in comparison to face to face, and in those courses/programs (e.g. Business and Nursing), assessment procedures are completely the same as for face to face. Teaching, student support, assessment and student learning accomplishment are substantially the same as face to face courses, with the addition of advanced student-identification procedures.

Greater attention is needed to program quality in large-scale distance education courses (graduate education programs). Within its graduate education degrees (masters, specialist), ASU offers some very large class sections: 500, 600, 700 students. For these, there is one qualified faculty instructor, and a grader for every 25 students. ASU does not include these in their assessment plans, and the education program only uses passwords for student authentication, vs. the more advanced techniques used in business and nursing. This is a particular concern because of the sheer numbers of students affected, and the difficulty of managing quality at that scale.

Core Component 3B: The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

Subcomponent 1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

Subcomponent 3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

Subcomponent 4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

Subcomponent 5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution’s mission.

Team Determination: _x_ Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
ASU’s general education program follows a standard distribution model. Courses articulate as transfer courses to fulfill general education requirements at other state institutions of higher education through the Arkansas Course Transfer System. Legislation has recently been implemented that led to a reduction in general education hours from 44-45 to 35 to align with the state general education core. General education goals were reduced from ten to five and were
revised to be more succinct and relevant. The provost has asked for a re-imagination of the general education curriculum, indicating that general education continues to be a site of inquiry and improvement.

Based upon the self-study, visiting classrooms and labs, and discussion with staff and faculty, students have many opportunities to develop skills adaptable to changing environments. As appropriate to the discipline, different programs offer varied high impact practices including capstone courses, internships, learning communities, undergraduate research, service learning, and writing intensive courses.

Diversity in the educational program was documented through the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, discussion with faculty and administrators, and observation on campus of programs, posters and flyers, and other materials. ASU sponsors many events such as Hispanic Heritage Month, Black History Month, Day of the Dead programs, and an LGBT lecture series. ASU offers minors in areas such as African-American Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and International Studies. The theme of the twentieth annual Delta Forum, held in the summer of 2013, was “Diversities in the Delta,” with presentations on diversity in relation to gender, class, race and ethnicity, religion, and regional culture within the Mississippi Delta and the American South.

Many faculty and administrators spoke proudly about campus internationalization. Bringing international students to campus is seen as a way to expose Arkansas students to the world and the global economy. Administrators and faculty see great potential for ASU-Mexico to increase attention to diversity. Opportunities for faculty and student exchange are planned. There are increasing numbers of international scholars and research with colleagues in other countries is encouraged. There are many study abroad opportunities. The College of Business has taken an unusual approach with their Global Leadership Experience, which enables students to have hands-on experience in developing countries, working with local participants on micro-businesses.

The number of international students has increased in recent years. Attention to success of international students is unclear. While domestic student admissions standards have changed to require ACT or SAT scores along with transcripts, international undergraduate applicants submit only transcripts and one of several options for demonstrating English language proficiency, including ASU’s ESL program. Retention of undergraduate international students appears to be problematic, therefore, ASU might consider both examining entrance requirements and providing professional development for faculty on ways to increase success of international students.

The first priority in ASU's strategic plan is to “refine Arkansas State University's mission and identity as an emerging global research institution.” The website and discussion with faculty, Graduate Council, and the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies documents that ASU has made considerable progress in this area. The need to increase research is widely supported for many reasons, including diversification of funding and as an integral part of economic and community development in Arkansas, according to the system president, community representatives, faculty, and administrators.

Faculty express support for the transition from a teaching institution to a research institution that also values teaching. ASU provides a variety of supports for scholarship, including a three-week Faculty R & D Institute in the summer to assist faculty with preparation of grant proposals, a faculty research fund, and competitive opportunities for reassigned time. Faculty sometimes are
able to create time for research through teaching larger classes. Some faculty have received external support from NSF, NEH, and the Department of Defense. An area of concern raised by faculty is increased support for scholarship for tenured faculty. In some colleges pretenure faculty have a reduced teaching load that is increased when they become tenured, making it more difficult to keep up their research. Another area to address is equipment and funding for research. According to the Faculty Senate Faculty Climate Survey, only 27% of respondents indicated that they have sufficient equipment and funding to conduct research.

Numerous faculty and student performances and exhibits take place. ASU sponsors the *Journal of International Studies* and the *Arkansas Review: a Journal of Delta Studies*. Students are involved with research and creative endeavors. Doctoral students are publishing. ASU provides financial support for undergraduate research and travel support for doctoral students. The Arkansas Biosciences Institute provides summer research funding for undergraduates. The Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship (SURF) program enables students to conduct in-depth research projects in their fields of study with the assistance of faculty mentors. All types of undergraduate research are eligible for support, and students from all academic disciplines are encouraged to apply. There is a program of research travel funds for undergraduate students. Students have the opportunity to share their scholarship through the annual Create@State Symposium. More than 3000 students participated in 2013.

Given the support for research and ASU’s clear commitment to students and learning, the university is well positioned to emphasize the scholarship of teaching and learning. Scholarship on assessment could be particularly valuable to further develop the culture of assessment.

**Core Component 3C:** The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

**Subcomponent 2.** All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

**Subcomponent 5.** Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

**Subcomponent 6.** Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

**Team Determination:**  
_x_ Core Component is met  
___ Core Component is met with concerns  
__ Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**
Based upon review of documents and vita, faculty have appropriate credentials. High school dual credit instructors must have similar credentials to faculty on campus, as is required for NACEP accreditation (ASU is NACEP accredited). The Dean of Continuing Education and Community Outreach and other administrators voiced concern about finding sufficient numbers of appropriately credentialed high school instructors in the future, as due to legislative changes, Arkansas teachers now have little incentive to earn graduate credits and current instructors will retire at some point.

Faculty who teach large and gateway courses, on the Graduate Council, and some in the general faculty stated that declining numbers of full-time faculty are a problem, leading to overwork in terms of large class sections, heavier advising loads, and some added class sections/faculty load (compensated and not compensated). The physical therapy accreditation report indicated issues with adequacy of faculty. However, the student-faculty ratio has remained steady. Administrators indicated that faculty lines may be moved from department/school to department/school as new programs are added and programs grow. This may lead to larger class sizes in some areas. Use of graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants occurs but faculty indicated hesitation about making use of graduate assistants because there are few available and they do not receive tuition waivers.

A review of documents and interviews with faculty and staff provided evidence that a variety of professional development opportunities are available to faculty and staff related to pedagogy, technology, and learning. Interactive Teaching and Technology Center (ITTC) staff assist faculty with the quality of blended and online courses and programs. Faculty members are able to contribute to their professions and keep up to date through participation in professional organizations and by making presentations at conferences. A concern that was raised by several groups is the uneven support for faculty development. Some programs receive differential tuition which can be used for this, while many do not.

Staff are appropriately qualified and are active in local and national professional organizations. Staff have extensive support for professional development, a tuition discount, and a financial incentive to earn degrees.

**Core Component 3D:** The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

- **Subcomponent 1.** The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
- **Subcomponent 2.** The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
- **Subcomponent 3.** The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
- **Subcomponent 4.** The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution’s offerings).
- **Subcomponent 5.** The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

**Team Determination:** _x_ Core Component is met
Evidence: ASU serves a wide variety of student populations, including face-to-face, online, international, underprepared, honors, transfer, and associate through Ph.D. Many services are provided such as the Career Services office, the Beck PRIDE Center for Veterans, Student Health Center, Multicultural Center, Living-Learning Communities, Disability Services, and the Office of International Programs. The library is well supported.

Extensive learning support services are provided including individual and group tutoring, course-based support, academic coaching, structured learning assistance, supplemental assistance, a writing lab and a math emporium. As a result of changing admissions requirements, the type of student services needed is changing. For example, the First Year Studies program for conditional admission and remedial students is changing due to the great reduction in remedial courses. Administrators stated that it is too early for evaluation of many of the support services, and no information was provided on effectiveness of each program and on return on investment. Developing evaluation systems, starting to gather data, and determining how to measure return on investment would assist ASU with directing limited resources to areas with the greatest impact for the changing student body.

Faculty who teach online courses reported that they considered that some students need greater preparation for success in an online environment. At the beginning of a semester many students need extensive hand-holding to get processes and logins working right. They report that success rate is lower in online courses, often with high rates of withdrawal. ITTC provides summer stipends for faculty to work on online and hybrid courses and course improvement generally.

Discussions with faculty and administrators, and tours of the facilities provide evidence that the institution provides the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning. Classrooms, labs, and other learning spaces have current technology and often state-of-the-art equipment. The Blackboard course management system is widely used. An area for improvement is the infrastructure to support the iPad initiative. Faculty in several meetings stated that there are bandwidth problems at times and that it appears that planning was insufficient in this area.

Core Component 3E: The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

Subcomponent 1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

Subcomponent 2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students’ educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Team Determination: 

_x_ Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
Based upon discussion with faculty, administrators, and community members, ASU contributes to students’ educational experiences in a variety of ways, including service learning, undergraduate and graduate research experiences, and study abroad. In the business program, study abroad emphasizes service and experience in developing countries. Arkansas State University offers counseling services, health services, student activities, intercultural and study abroad opportunities, residence life activities, internships, credit for prior learning, and career services. In total, these services provide evidence of Arkansas State University’s ability to create effective learning environments for students.

ASU provides widespread high-tech opportunities, ranging from a large SIM lab in nursing to a complete television studio to an NPR station. On-line program support is extensive. The new Center for Digital Initiatives engages students in cutting-edge projects and engages faculty in creation of innovative visualizations for classroom use, such as a virtual hospital for educating future health professionals. This center also is bringing national visibility to ASU.

Interviews with faculty and a review of documents provides evidence that Arkansas State University has numerous resources available to support students and enable those who need developmental education or academic support to have access to the necessary tools to provide them with a path to success. Arkansas State University provides an early alert system to increase early identification of at-risk students, and intense interventions are provided to help them succeed.

The library provides assistance and guidance in many ways in the effective use of research and information resources. For example, the Office of Assessment, along with the library, administered an information literacy test in 2012. Based on the findings, the library and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences are piloting an “embedded librarian,” with a librarian co-teaching a humanities course to improve information literacy skills.

Students have opportunity to develop leadership. Student Organization Leadership training provides hands-on training on how to recruit members, write a constitution, create a strategic plan, use parliamentary procedure, plan and market events, resolve conflict, and retain members. There is an Emerging Student Leader program, Student Government, Student Activities Board, and opportunities in academically related societies.

ASU serves a wide variety of student populations, including face-to-face, online, international, underprepared, honors, transfer, and associate through Ph.D. Many services are provided such as the Career Services office, the Beck PRIDE Center for Veterans, Student Health Center, Multicultural Center, Living-Learning Communities, Disability Services, and the Office of International Programs. The library is well supported.

Extensive learning support services are provided including individual and group tutoring, course-based support, academic coaching, structured learning assistance, supplemental assistance, a writing lab and a math emporium. No information was provided on effectiveness of each program and on return on investment. As a result of changing admissions requirements, the type of student services needed is changing. For example, the First Year Studies program for conditional admission and remedial students is changing due to the great reduction in remedial courses. Administrators stated that it is too early for evaluation of many of the support services. However, developing evaluation systems, starting to gather data, and determining how to measure return on investment would assist ASU with directing limited resources to areas with the greatest impact for the changing student body.
Discussions with faculty and administrators, and tours of the facilities provide evidence that the institution provides the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning. Classrooms, labs, and other learning spaces have current technology and often state-of-the-art equipment. The Blackboard course management system is widely used.

**Team Determination on Criterion Three:**

- _x_ Criterion is met  
- __ Criterion is met with concerns  
- __ Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**
ASU effectively provides coursework and programs with current content and appropriate goals and objectives. Facilities range from adequate to exceptional across disciplines including health sciences, arts, and business. A wide variety of support services are available for students at all levels.

As the qualifications of the undergraduates change, ASU should devote targeted assessment attention to understanding the relative value of the individual programs so as to support those which are most effective. In addition, online learning particularly but not exclusively in the “large-scale” (ASU terminology) courses and programs would benefit from more direct assessment and use of results for curricular and delivery improvements.

**CRITERION FOUR: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement.** The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

**Core Component 4A:** The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

- **Subcomponent 1.** The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
- **Subcomponent 2.** The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.
- **Subcomponent 3.** The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
- **Subcomponent 4.** The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
- **Subcomponent 5.** The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
- **Subcomponent 6.** The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree
programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

**Team Determination:**

_ X _ Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

ASU has conducted regular program reviews for years but, for some programs, has recently changed the structure and timing of such reviews. Between the extensive number of specialized accreditations it holds and a newly reconfigured program review process, ASU has a robust process for external reviews.

ASU has 25 discipline-specific accreditations. These were reported in the institution’s self-study and are posted on its website in multiple locations. Over half of ASU’s students are within those disciplines. Such accreditations require regular program review. The outcomes of those reviews must also be submitted to the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE).

State statute requires that the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) conduct regular reviews of academic programs at the state’s universities and colleges. For those programs not covered by discipline specific accreditations, there are a series of requirements for the external review: a drafting of a comprehensive self-study, the selection of at least two out-of-state reviewers, a site visit, and the completion of an evaluation by the external reviewers. The outcome of the process is to be reported to the AHECB.

In response to these mandates, ASU has established a comprehensive schedule for program review. Since the state mandates are recent, as of the time of the HLC team’s visit only a few of the institution’s programs had undergone review within the new framework.

The site team’s analysis of three program reviews (chemistry, physics, and biology) shows reviews of varying depth, but overall the review process shows evidence of encouraging extended analysis and self-reflection at the departmental level while also helping to ensure program quality and rigor. The quality of the external teams’ analysis was high and offered thoughtful commentary on the departments’ self-studies.

ASU has in place policies regarding transcripted credit. While the bulk of its transcripted credit is gained in regular courses, there are exceptions including the awarding of credit for College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and military credit. These policies, including for CLEP and IB, are described in the General Bulletin, including minimum scores and other restrictions on the awarding of credit for prior learning.

ASU has placed limits on the total number of degree hours that can be gained through these alternative means, capping them at 15 hours for associate degrees and 30 hours for bachelors. Such credit is not awarded grades.

Each year several hundred students are awarded credit through concurrent enrollment courses taught by high school faculty in such schools in ASU’s service area. ASU has a concurrent enrollment policy that meets HLC policy on minimum faculty credentials. The institution’s concurrent enrollment policy mandates that department chairpersons review the
credentials of high school faculty teaching any course for ASU credit. Conversations with multiple deans and associate deans confirmed that department chairpersons do regularly review such credentials. Faculty credential review documents signed by department chairpersons are collected and maintained in the respective dean’s office.

For transfer credit, ASU only accepts courses from US institutions that have been accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies. The Office of International Programs reviews non-US institutions to determine if they are properly accredited.

A review of the university’s website showed that articulation credit agreements/policies and practices are not accessible by the general public, in contrast to standard practice. Greater transparency on this issue is desirable.

As evidenced by the ASU self-study and conversations with ASU academic personnel, the institution’s academic department and colleges determine the content, rigor, and prerequisites for courses. As is shown by a review of several specialized accreditation and regular program review reports, degree program structure and content falls within nationally accepted standards. Concurrent courses use the same materials and syllabi as on-campus courses.

ASU has in place an academic structure that includes review processes for the undergraduate and graduate curricula. In addition, the general education curriculum undergoes periodic review. Regular faculty play the lead role in this structure, as is referenced in the self-study and which was confirmed via document review and conversations with ASU personnel.

The institution collects data about the success of its graduates. In many fields this includes tracking licensure testing success rates. ASU does not post available data for some programs, however. Greater transparency on this would be desirable.

Core Component 4B: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

Subcomponent 2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

Subcomponent 4. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Team Determination: ___ Core Component is met
_x_ Core Component is met with concerns
___ Core Component is not met

Evidence:
The institution demonstrates, although in an uneven and sometimes incomplete manner, an ongoing growing commitment to educational achievement and improvement through the
continual assessment of student learning in line with the university mission. These efforts are supported through the Academic Affairs and Research Department which actively engages all levels of the university in the full process of assessment, in addition to college-level and faculty engagement.

The university has clearly stated goals for student learning at the university level, program level and course level. These goals are available on the university webpages. The university goals of thinking critically, global awareness, and using technology are found throughout the program level goals. These university level learning outcomes have been effectively evaluated using multiple measures, and have demonstrated student learning through the ETS Proficiency Profile of Critical Thinking Assessment, the Global Perspectives Inventory, and the SmART Measure and Senior Exit Inventory. The results of these inventories are provided in the self-study.

The method of evaluating “thinking critically” is under transition, and will include the CAT© critical thinking assessment, provided by Tennessee Technical University, for future evaluations. This decision to change the measure of critical thinking was motivated by faculty feedback. This new assessment measure requires more faculty engagement in the critical thinking assessment process and active response to those assessment results. There is substantial buy-in to this new assessment process in a commitment of time and finances by most or all colleges.

Program level goals are provided on the university webpages. Each program’s process of assessment is provided with both curriculum mapping and assessment plans. These plans include both direct and indirect measures, and include assessments and inventories, such as but not limited pre- to post- learning gains, employer feedback about preparedness, and student satisfaction about preparedness. These assessment measures are complimented by licensure exams (i.e., PRAXIS) as well as the 25 program areas that are supported by additional accreditation processes. Learning outcomes are also evidenced by student scholarship.

The institution assesses achievement of learning outcomes through the ongoing process of feedback about the assessment plans, the assessment reports, and evidence through the recommendations provided by the Academic Affairs division and assessment office. Results are evaluated on the university level as well as at program and general education level. The process of assessment evaluation is open and supported by faculty.

A significant gap in assessment processes that requires attention is found in the distance education area, specifically in Large Scale Distance Education (ASU terminology) courses and programs. Assessment in that program, contrary to the norms described in the self-study and in contrast to online programs in business and nursing, is below the standard of assessment in the brick-and-mortar classes. The 2012 NCATE evaluation feedback also indicated a need for improvement of assessment processes for the distance learning programs, specifically for advanced degrees. This report also found a greater need for data collection and assessment on regarding knowledge, skills, and dispositions for the non-certification degrees.

The institution has made some gains towards using the information gained from assessments to improve student learning. Assessment committee team members communicate a commitment to the use of assessment to drive instruction; however group meetings reveal some difficulty articulating the goal of assessment. Feedback from
interviews and document reviews indicate that assessment results are often used to identify student problems or characteristics rather than used to reflect on teaching problems or assess needed changes in instructional practices.

There are some notable examples of assessment practices being used to alter and improve teaching practices. For instance, standards and evaluation across Composition 1 courses were found to be uneven. As a consequence, a number of faculty in that area have come together and developed additional, more precise student learning outcomes and course objectives. They have developed a shared assessment rubric with a goal of greater consistency in course evaluation, in part aimed at overcoming grade inflation. These changes are to be fully implemented in fall 2014.

The institution has a process in place to methodically evaluate student learning based on current level of assessment processes. This system includes both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis and has reliability estimates. The process is guided by the goals set forth by the Academic Affairs and Research Department, and is supported by faculty and program level personnel. The institution should improve current practice in regard to size and representation of sampling for university level assessments. The Global Perspectives Inventory sample of students was limited in size and representation (included 89 College of Business students, predominately international students). Future evaluations should include students from multiple colleges and across all demographic groups.

The use of assessment results to impact instruction has not been fully realized by the faculty. Although faculty discuss the scholarship of teaching, and indicate active scholarship in the area of assessment has occurred (e.g., scholarly presentations on assessment practices), faculty do not communicate an appreciation for the Boyer model of scholarship. This type of scholarship could serve as a bridge to the university’s growth as a research institute.

**Core Component 4C:** The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

**Team Determination:** 

_x_ Core Component is met

___ Core Component is met with concerns

___ Core Component is not met
Evidence:
ASU has articulated ambitious goals for student retention and completion. Historically, in a pattern that is common for many institutions with open admissions policies, it had a high dropout or failure rate. ASU has changed its admissions requirements and is working to substantially improve its retention and completion rates.

ASU collects and analyzes data about student success, or the lack thereof. It has utilized this data in a number of ways. For instance, it has identified courses with especially high D, F, or withdraw rates. On the basis of this analysis, it has changed course prerequisites (e.g., in the introductory chemistry course) or created new courses (e.g., a new math course for non-science majors equivalent to college algebra).

While the institution’s retention and completion goals may well be achievable, much of the reason for that is likely to be the different profile of students the institution is now admitting. Over the past few years ASU has tightened its admission requirements. The changes are appropriately being phased in gradually and will not go fully into effect until the 2014-15 academic year.

As ASU points out in its self-study (Criterion Four), the changes in student profile alone should push the institution’s completion rate up by over 10%. A number of other changes have also been adopted. For instance, the ASU Enrollment Management committee has changed policies regarding heavy course loads for first year and conditional admit students. These changes too are likely to prove helpful, although perhaps not at a rate significant enough to affect the larger completion rate.

Team Determination on Criterion Four:

Criterion is met
Criterion is met with concerns
Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:
Summary Statement: This criterion is met on components 4 A and 4 C. It is met with concerns on 4 B. ASU has a rigorous standard for program reviews. It has a reasonable set of policies in place regarding credit evaluation, acceptance of transfer credit, and other areas, and there is good evidence of adherence to these policies. It maintains appropriate specialized accreditations. There are areas, such as in publication of licensure passing rates and transfer policies, in which the institution can be more transparent. Based on the evidence provided through the self-study, supporting documents, and site visit, it is clear that the institution is committed to educational achievement and improvement. There is room for growth in the area of assessment and a need to further use of assessment results for improving instructional practices. Courses and programs delivered through the Large Scale Distance Education format are an area of significant concern. Still, the assessment leadership is committed to the ongoing development to the assessment processes and systems in an effort to support student learning and provides robust and helpful assistance to faculty.

CRITERION FIVE: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and
opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

**Core Component 5A:** The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

**Subcomponent 3.** The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution’s organization, resources, and opportunities.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

**Subcomponent 5.** The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

**Team Determination:**

- Core Component is met
- Core Component is met with concerns
- Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**
The audited financial statements show steady growth in the Education and General revenues, the Auxiliary Revenues, as well as Restricted Revenues over the last five years. Tuition and fee revenues increased 19.5% while state appropriations have remained flat. Tuition at ASU remains comparatively low among public universities in Arkansas, but as an institution where 75% of students require state, federal or university financial support and no tuition increase is expected for 2015, the institution will need to be even more fiscally prudent. The institution does not expect the state’s shift to a performance based funding model to negatively impact their financial situation.

In the last five years, federal and state grants also increased by 40%. Analysis of expenses show that 38% was allocated to instruction, academic support, and research initiatives; 29% to scholarships and fellowships; 5% to student services; 13% to plant maintenance; and 8% to public service accounts. These allocations show that the university is focused on student learning and success.

Staff and faculty numbers are currently adequate to support the operations of the institution, and the student ratio of 19:1 along with the high percentage of student semester credit hours taught by full time faculty provide evidence of a learning centered institution. However, faculty have noted that class sizes have increased, hampering their abilities to promote student success.

As indicated in documents and confirmed by team-member visits, the physical infrastructure ranges from adequate to exceptional in terms of performance, laboratory, and teaching spaces. Faculty feel that additional space is needed for research, but the opening of a new classroom building may allow some expansion. Equipment holdings are inconsistent; in some areas, the equipment holdings are more than adequate, but faculty also report that more equipment is needed to support the growing research focus. Recent improvements to
the campus, including new housing, reconfiguration of road access and new buildings have resulted in an attractive and safe setting. The Campus Master Plan determined that the university has sufficient physical plant resources to support current operations.

The institution is evaluating the value, both academic and financial, of a cooperative agreement with private partners to create a new campus in Querétaro, Mexico, a city that boasts development by multi-national corporations. The institution is doing due diligence in examining a range of budget scenarios to ascertain the impact on the university’s resources. They are in contact with HLC staff to ensure timely completion of any needed approvals.

State law caps allocations to scholarships and athletics and prohibits athletic deficits. ASU has devoted about 10% of its tuition and fee income to academic and performance scholarships, well below the state maximum of 30%. As a public institution and member of the Arkansas State University system, it does not disburse funds to any superordinate entity.

The university’s Technology Plan is aligned with the Strategic Plan and driven by academics, student needs, technology trends, and is enriched with the feedback from students, faculty, and staff. Interviews with students, faculty, and administrators showed that support for online learning and technology assisted learning appears to be generally adequate, although the freshman iPad initiative has put a significant drain on wireless resources and thus has not reached its full potential. Support for online pedagogy, including course design and development, is offered through the Interactive Teaching and Technology Center (ITTC).

A high priority for ASU is to develop a global research presence and to change its Carnegie classification accordingly. To this end, in 2004, the Arkansas Biosciences Institute was sited in Jonesboro, adding over 100,000 square feet of research space. However, a recent campus survey found that only 27% of faculty reported that they had adequate space and equipment for research. Differential tuition has provided additional revenue to provide equipment funds for newly hired faculty. Faculty also expressed concerns about the availability of travel funds to support their professional growth.

Historically, faculty salaries have been lower than peer institutions, resulting in some difficulty attracting and retaining faculty. Especially in light of the institutional priorities to enhance the research focus and teaching excellence at the institution, it has been particularly important to address this issue. Four colleges have already implemented differential tuition, allowing for higher salaries and enhanced professional development; this does place a greater financial strain on a majority of ASU students. Overall, significant progress is being made in bringing faculty salaries closer to peer institutions.

Discussion with campus administration revealed that the institution has not established development/fund-raising priorities. The institution would benefit by long-range planning in this area.

Documents, interviews and discussions indicate that the institution is well positioned to achieve the other strategic priorities of the institution.

Appropriate faculty credentials are adhered to in the hiring of both full-time and part-time faculty and 79.5% of full-time ASU faculty hold a terminal degree. Outside of the academic units, the divisions of Student Affairs and Finance and Administration have high levels of
employees holding a master’s degree, particularly those in leadership positions. Search committees involved in the hiring help to ensure the required qualifications are met. ASU offers a variety of professional development opportunities to staff members, such as technology training, conferences, workshops, seminars and other training courses. Staff noted professional development opportunities as a strength of the institution. Based on interviews and discussions with faculty and deans, the support for faculty professional development is inconsistent across the ten colleges of the university.

The university has adopted Budget Planning Principles to ensure that the allocation of resources is consistent with the needs of students and the university’s strategic plan. Budgeting is a participatory process distributed amongst the university units under the overall guidance of the University Planning Committee with leadership from the Chancellor and the Executive Committee. Distribution of funds between academic and non-academic functions are determined by the Executive Council, informed through shared governance and representation of faculty, staff and students. The Office of Finance is responsible for resource management, budget development and financial monitoring and reporting.

While the university plans biennial budgets in concert with the state funding cycle, it does not engage in long term budgetary processes based on projected enrollments, special projects (e.g. Mexico Campus) and other factors. While budgets are carefully managed and monitored, future financial projections are not used to address long-term financial sustainability.

Arkansas State University has the flexibility to respond to unexpected opportunities, as evidenced by the potential development of the Mexico campus, and the tobacco settlement funding that provided resources for the Arkansas Biosciences institute. Similarly, explorations of a public-private partnership to develop a Osteopathic Medicine program on campus in order to enhance the reputation and take ASU to a higher level provide evidence of an entrepreneurial, but measured, institution.

**Core Component 5B:** The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution’s governance.

**Subcomponent 2.** The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

**Team Determination:**

- _x_ Core Component is met
- ___ Core Component is met with concerns
- ___ Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**
Under the new leadership (new chancellor as of 2012), shared governance at ASU has increased in relevance and use as the process has been refined to meet the needs of the campus. Numerous committees have been formed each with a specific purview and the whole process is administered by the Shared Governance Oversight Committee. Leaders from this committee and the Faculty Senate, the Student Association and the Staff Senate are included in the Chancellor’s Executive Council.

The formalized structures for shared governance have resulted in clear and substantial progress and increased support, at all levels, for the principles of communication and accountability, representation, and procedural integrity. Interviews with faculty and administration confirm that most members of the campus community believe that shared governance, while not perfect, has improved tremendously and greater trust is being established, especially under the new institutional leadership. A more clear understanding of the scope of authority of various bodies and groups would help communication and appreciation for decisions made.

The bylaws of the Board of Trustees grant them the authority of the entire management and control of the activities, affairs, operations, business, and property of the Arkansas State University System. The Board may exercise its management and control through delegation to officers, committees, or agents as appropriate. Interviews with three members of the Board of Trustees revealed individuals knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the institution, its finances, its major initiatives, its priorities and its students.

Faculty, students, and staff can influence decisions and courses of action relative to academic requirements, policy and process for the Jonesboro campus of ASU through the Academic Shared Governance Committees. Their role and composition is well defined. System wide changes are handled separately.

**Core Component 5C:** The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

Subcomponent 2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

Subcomponent 3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

Subcomponent 4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

Subcomponent 5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

**Team Determination:**

- x Core Component is met
- ___ Core Component is met with concerns
- ___ Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

One of the university’s strategic priorities is to “continually improve our institutional efficacy and alignment of resources with our priorities.” Interviews with campus administrators
revealed that, in congruence with the stated institutional priorities, a shift in funding from non-academic to academic functions has occurred under new institutional leadership, as the institution shifts its focus from finances to academics. Campus interviews suggested that the institution could re-examine its administrative structure, program offerings, and additional cost saving measures to redirect resources to better support this academic mission.

The faculty has the responsibility for assessment of student learning, which is guided by the Learning Outcomes Advisory Council, the university-level assessment council, and the General Education Committee. The institution has begun linking financial information alongside student learning, program enrollment, program viability, and labor market data.

The various shared government committees and senates are the primary contributors to the university’s planning process and feedback from external stakeholders contribute to the input. Interviews with employers and internship coordinators revealed general satisfaction with the quality of the students coming from ASU, and with the responsiveness of the institution to meeting business needs.

Campus discussions relating to the freshman iPad project revealed gaps in communication, shared governance and planning. The program was initiated in response to the First Year Experience faculty, but other faculty were not consulted. The technological resources were not well planned, resulting in multiple student and faculty concerns about the availability of wireless signals. While IT tried to respond to those concerns, the project is not reaching its full potential due to these issues. Students were also disappointed that they were required to rent or purchase iPads for what they perceived as limited value in one class.

Projections for state appropriations remain relatively stable but are not expected to have capacity to increase support for higher education. At the same time, changing population demographics show a decrease in the number of high school graduates. Balancing this decrease is a higher fraction of well-prepared high school graduates who will seek higher education, resulting in projections for steady on-campus enrollments. Online programs are expected to grow as additional markets, particularly in Latin America, are developed. ASU anticipates and prepares for possible revenue changes by implementing conservative increases in tuition and fees; cost containment measures; marketing and branding strategies; focused student recruitment, including international; internal reallocations in support of institutional priorities; and various entrepreneurial initiatives, such as the possible implementations of a Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine program and the Mexico campus. The institution has also been proactive in pursing effective partnerships with private entities and other institutions. The institution works with accreditors (HLC and specialized) to integrate approvals with its internal planning. The Mexico campus idea is not yet at the stage where ASU will request formal approval, but they are well aware of the need to do so.

While ASU is already authorized by the Commission to offer programs online without limitations (100%), at all stages of development and expansion, to both domestic and international audiences, they need to ensure that they provide effective student support.

Core Component 5D: The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its
component parts.

**Team Determination:**

- _x_ Core Component is met
- __ Core Component is met with concerns
- __ Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

ASU uses multiple methods to evaluate its operations: fiscal evaluation with internal and external audits; annual performance evaluations of its faculty, administrators, and staff members; academic assessment through accreditations and external reviews; and co-curricular and institutional evaluation using standard instruments like NSSE and CIRP. In recent years, constantly changing leadership has hampered the institution's ability to systematically assess and improve its performance, but the new administration recognizes the importance of such evaluation.

The university uses internal and external review processes with the goal of continued improvement. The annual state audits provide useful feedback for improving financial operations. University staff participate in professional development activities in national professional associations (i.e., NACUBO, SCUP, etc.) where they have opportunities to learn best practices.

Additional evidence of closing the loop is provided throughout other operational divisions of the university: Campus Safety; Student-Centered Commencement; consolidation of Admissions units; the Mascot project; brand identity and updated logos;

**Team Determination on Criterion Five:**

- _x_ Criterion is met
- __ Criterion is met with concerns
- __ Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

Thanks to the Revenue Stabilization Act, the state of Arkansas has not suffered significant budget cuts during the recent economic downturn. Nonetheless, public higher education remains underfunded and Arkansas State University funding is the lowest of any four-year institution in the state despite its record enrollment growth. In addition, the state does not have a dedicated capital revenue source and the universities must bear the cost of maintaining aging facilities. Even with this harsh reality, ASU has been able to enhance learning facilities and continues to look for entrepreneurial opportunities of alternate funding. The physical campus is well-maintained and serves current needs. Evidence of financial strength is provided by financial audits, accreditations and program assessments, productivity of faculty and staff, and advancements in technology.

Arkansas State University has defined some clear strategic priorities and is allocating and obtaining resources to achieve those goals. The institution has recently reallocated internal resources to support its academic mission and has developed partnerships with public and private entities to further support its research mission.

Since the last site visit, the university has made a strong effort to build a culture of shared
The campus community has generally embraced the structures and improved culture where faculty, administration, staff, and students have input into decisions regarding policy and procedures. The shared governance process, while not at its full potential, has improved transparency and provides opportunities for participation in university governance.

ASU has completed two cycles of strategic planning since the last comprehensive visit that have been more intentionally systematic and integrated. The current strategic plan is considered a living document as action steps are completed and new initiatives are added. The Enrollment Management Plan has been significant in increasing student enrollment and retention. Other comprehensive plans include the Campus Master Plan, the Emergency Operation Plan, the University Assessment Plan, the General Education Assessment Plan, the Minority Retention Plan, and Marketing and Management Plan.

V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION

A. Affiliation Status

1. Recommendation: Continued accreditation


3. Rationale: With minor exceptions, well within the ability of the institution to address, ASU meets all Criteria for accreditation, providing a productive environment for learning, research, and service to their constituencies, supported by appropriate resources and thoughtful planning.

4. Criterion-related Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):

   Monitoring: Report: Within three months of Commission action: a report on Transparency part A: Document the availability of publicly accessible information or useful links on all licensure pass-rates

   Rationale: At the time of the visit, NCLEX and Praxis results were inaccessible to potential students.

   Monitoring Report: By 12 months from Commission action, a report on Assessment: A report that a) documents assessment of large-scale distance education courses (including all those with 100+ students enrolled) and plans to use the results to improve student learning; b) includes examples from each college of using assessment data to change teaching / pedagogy, not just identifying students / providing student services.

   Rationale: At the time of the visit, interviewees and NCATE reviews showed limited assessment of education-program "large-scale distance education" (a University term). In addition when asked about the use of data, most interviewees gave examples of identifying student issues, rather than teaching / teacher issues that could be addressed.

5. Federal Compliance Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):

   Monitoring: Report: Within three months of Commission action: a report on Transparency, part B: Document the availability of publicly accessible information or useful links to lists outlining articulation and 2+2 agreements, and place(s) where students can receive more information, if needed.

   Rationale: At the time of the visit, the team was unable to identify lists that were publically available regarding the institutions and types of articulation agreements that are involved.
B. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action

VI. EMBEDDED CHANGES IN AFFILIATION STATUS

Did the team review any of the following types of change in the course of its evaluation? Check Yes or No for each type of change.

(   ) Yes (   ) No Legal Status
(   ) Yes (   ) No Degree Level
(   ) Yes (   ) No Program Change
(   ) Yes (   ) No Distance or Correspondence Education
(   ) Yes (   ) No Contractual or Consortial Arrangements
(   ) Yes (   ) No Mission or Student Body
(   ) Yes (   ) No Clock or Credit Hour
(   ) Yes (   ) No Additional Locations or Campuses
(   ) Yes (   ) No Access to Notification
(   ) Yes (   ) No Access to Expedited Desk Review
(   ) Yes (   ) No Teach-out Arrangement
(   ) Yes (   ) No Other Change

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS
Appendix A
Interactions with Constituencies

Group meetings
Open meeting with staff (26 attendees)
Open meeting with faculty (110)
Newly hired faculty (1-3 years) (29)
Residential students (13)
Graduate students (33)
Doctoral students (26)
Honors College faculty (24)
Faculty in large/gateway courses (35)
Faculty teaching online (32)
Adjuncts (12)
Employers (17)
Internship site representatives (33)

President (system)
Chancellor (institution)
Board of Trustees (3 of 5)
Executive Committee
Director of Institutional Research
General Education Committee
Financial Aid staff
Finance unit staff
Deans of all 9 schools
Vice Provost of Research and Graduate Studies, Chair of IRB
Arkansas Biosciences Institute representative
Library dean + librarians
Associate Vice Chancellor/ CIO
Faculty Education and Technology Committee
Shared Governance Oversight Committee
Officers of Faculty Senate
Officers of Staff Senate
Dean of Student Development and Staff
Student government leaders; Panhellenic executive committee
Athletics department director and staff
University College / student support services staff
Employee Benefits Committee
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and staff
Advancement staff
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Chairs of various departments
Assessment representatives from colleges
Appendix B
Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

Website: academic programs, student services, admissions, transfer, consumer education, course listings, etc.
Bulletin: Graduate, Undergraduate
Handbooks: Faculty, Staff, Student
Sample of syllabi (graduate, undergraduate, online)
Sample of faculty vitae (full time, adjunct)
ASU Composition Community Rubric/Characteristics of “ABCDF” Writing
Composition I Goals, Learning Outcomes, and Course Objectives
2013 Writing Program Initiatives
Composition Assessment—Spring 2013
Assessment Report for Educational Leadership (report dated 10/29/13)
Assessment Report for Curriculum and Instruction (report dated 10/29/13)
Assessment Report for Special Education—Instructional Specialist (report dated 10/29/13)
Assessment Website Information for Educational Theory and Practice MSE (no date given)
Assessment Website Information for Educational Leadership MSE (no date given)
Assessment Website Information for Curriculum and Instruction MSE (no date given)
Assessment Website Information, Beebe Campus (no date given)
Assessment Website Information, Mountain Home Campus (no date given)
Rubric—Single Subject Design Phase, Special Education Program (April, 2012)
Special Education Assessment Matrix (April, 2012)
Departmental Response to Program Review, Department of Biological Sciences (April, 2013)
Program Review, Department of Biological Sciences (April, 2013)
Chemistry Programs Self-Study (Spring, 2013)
Arkansas state assessment reports; ASU assessment reports
AHECB Policy 5.16: Concurrent Enrollment (effective Fall 2013)
BA Criminology, Recommendations from Office of Assessment (2013)
Strategic Plans, plan updates
Housing Occupancy Report
Complaint Binders
Diversity Strategic Report
Minority Retention Plan
Student Satisfaction Survey
ASU Commencement - Summer 2013
2013-2014 Operating Budget
Legislative Audits 2011-12, 2010-11, 2009-10
Student Affairs Customer Complaints
HLC Student Survey Results, ASU
2013 Library User Survey
Appendix C
Federal Compliance Worksheet

Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams
Effective September 1, 2013 – August 31, 2014

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation, where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution’s ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

This worksheet outlines the information the team should review in relation to the federal requirements and provides spaces for the team’s conclusions in relation to each requirement. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Guide for Institutions and Evaluation Teams in completing this worksheet. The Guide identifies applicable Commission policies and an explanation of each requirement. The worksheet becomes an appendix to the team’s report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, it should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section in the team report template.

Institution under review: _____Arkansas State University (Jonesboro)

Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Address this requirement by completing the “Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours” in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

1. Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints as well as the history of complaints received and processed with a particular focus in that history on the past three or four years.
2. Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
3. Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into its review and planning processes.
4. Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

___ x ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:
Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

http://www.astate.edu/a/consumer-information/index.dot

The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

1. Review the institution’s transfer policies.

2. Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and program-specific articulation agreements.

3. Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its web site) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

___ x ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:  Information about general transfer of individual courses is handled appropriately and openly. However, while the institution has a number of 2+2 and articulation agreements these are not publicly posted anywhere or described in the bulletin. The word “articulated” in reference to courses is used in the Nursing section of the Bulletin, but not explained. Staff interviewees said that if students were interested in transferring into particular programs, they could ask counselors at the
community colleges about options. Student interviewees demonstrated confusion about transfer policies.

Additional monitoring, if any: Monitoring Report # 1: Transparency

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.

1. Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams, and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution’s approach respects student privacy.

2. Check that any fees related to verification and not included in tuition are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance courses (e.g., a proctoring fee paid by students on the day of the proctored exam).

3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

   ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

   ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: Two areas (business and nursing) use a remote proctoring program, but the largest program, Education, does not. This program relies on completion of projects and papers (rather than exams) but has no specific methodologies addressing student verification. Greater progress towards use of more robust systems than passwords is desirable across programs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.

This requirement has several components the institution and team must address:

- General Program Requirements. The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.

- Financial Responsibility Requirements. The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department’s review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if
an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)

- **Default Rates.** The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.

- **Student Right to Know.** The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

- **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission’s web site for more information.)

- **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission’s web site for more information.)

1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.

2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution’s compliance or whether the institution’s auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution’s compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.

4. If issues have been raised with the institution’s compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution’s ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (Core Component 2.A and 2.B).

5. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:
   - X   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
   -   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
   -   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
   -   The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Required Information for Students and the Public**

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.

2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:
   - X The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
   -   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
   -   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
   -   The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information**

*The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.*
1. Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with the Commission to determine whether the information it provides is accurate and complete, appropriately formatted and contains the Commission’s web address.

2. Review institutional disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.

3. Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate information to current and prospective students about its accreditation, placement or licensure, program requirements, etc.

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

   _x__  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

   ___  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___  The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

   Comments:
   Additional monitoring, if any:

**Review of Student Outcome Data**

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.

2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.

3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

   _x__ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

   ___  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___  The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

   Comments: Please see more details in the Assurance report

   Additional monitoring, if any:

**Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies**
The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team has considered any potential implications for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or loss of authorization in any state.

**Important note:** If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial, or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.

2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution’s capacity to meet the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.

3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

   - ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
   - ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
   - ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
   - ___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

   Comments:

   Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment**

The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. **Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to the team’s review of the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.**

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

   _x_  The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

   ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

   ___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list materials reviewed here:

   - Bulletins, undergraduate and graduate
   - Website (general, programs, financial aid, admissions, etc.)
   - Interviews with faculty and program administrators
   - Student complaint files (academic, behavioral, traffic)
Appendix

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Program Length and Tuition, Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours

Institution under review: ______Arkansas State University

Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

Instructions

The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Review the “Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours” as well as the course catalog and other attachments required for the institutional worksheet.

Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

A. Answer the Following Questions

Are the institution’s degree program requirements within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

__X__ Yes   _____ No

Comments:

Are the institution’s tuition costs across programs within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

__X__ Yes   _____ No

Comments: High volume and expensive programs have differential tuition, which is used to improve class size, faculty productivity and retention; tuition and fees are clearly disclosed.

B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution’s program length and tuition practices?

_____ Yes   __x__ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:
Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions
In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps:

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution’s academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution’s policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.

2. Identify the institution’s principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
   - Associate’s degrees = 60 hours
   - Bachelor’s degrees = 120 hours
   - Master’s or other degrees beyond the Bachelor’s = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor’s degree
   - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
   - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.

3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
   - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
   - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
   - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
   - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.

4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.

5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
• At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.

• For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.

• Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.

• For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

• The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.

• Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.

6. Consider the following questions:

• Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?

• Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework Typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?

• For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?

• Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

• If so, is the institution’s assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?

7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:

• If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.

• If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or single department or division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.

• If the team identifies systematic non-compliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify Commission staff immediately and work with staff to design appropriate follow-up activities. The Commission shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.
Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team (see #5 of instructions in completing this section)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1) Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

___x___ Yes

___ No

Comments:

Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution’s policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

___x___ Yes

___ No

Comments:

For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

___x___ Yes

___ No

Comments:

Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

___x___ Yes

___ No

Comments:

2) Application of Policies

Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

___x___ Yes

___ No
Comments:

Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution’s policy on the award of credit?

__x__ Yes     ____ No

Comments:

If the institution offers any alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, were the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of academic credit?

__x__ Yes     ____ No

Comments:

If the institution offers alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution’s policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

__x__ Yes     ____ No

Comments:

Is the institution’s actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

__x__ Yes     ____ No

Comments:

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this section. If the team has responded “no” to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign Commission follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution’s credit hour policies and practices?

_____ Yes   _xx__ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

D. Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour
Part 3: Clock Hours

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours?

_____ Yes  _____ No

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

_____ Yes  _____ No

If the answer to either question is “Yes,” complete this part of the form.

Instructions

This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Complete this worksheet only if the institution offers any degree or certificate programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock-hour programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.

For these programs Federal regulations require that they follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction provided that the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour include at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

Does the institution’s credit to clock hour formula match the federal formula?

_____ Yes  _____ No

Comments:
If the credit to clock hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class?

Did the team determine that the institution’s credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers “No” to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

____ Yes  ____ No

Comments:

Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

____ Yes  ____ No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution’s credit to clock hour conversion?

____ Yes  ____ No

(Note that the team may approve a lower conversion rate than the federal rate as noted above provided the team found no issues with the institution’s policies or practices related to the credit hour and there is sufficient student work outside of class as noted in the instructions.)

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution’s clock hour policies and practices?

____ Yes  ____ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS WORKSHEET

| INSTITUTION and STATE: Arkansas State University AR |
| TYPE OF REVIEW: Comprehensive Evaluation |
| DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW: |
| DATES OF REVIEW: 10/28/2013 - 10/30/2013 |

☐ No Change in Statement of Affiliation Status

Nature of Organization

| CONTROL: Public |
| RECOMMENDATION: nc |
| DEGREES AWARDED: Certificate, Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Specialist, Doctors |
| RECOMMENDATION: nc |

Conditions of Affiliation

| STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS: |
| Accreditation at the Doctor’s level is limited to the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, the Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science, in Heritage Studies, and in Molecular Biosciences, the Doctor of Physical Therapy, and the Doctor of Nursing Practice. |
| RECOMMENDATION: nc |

| APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS: |
| The Commission's Notification Program is available for new locations within the United States. |
| RECOMMENDATION: nc |

| APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES: |
| The institution has been approved under Commission policy to offer up to 100% of its total degree programs through distance education. The processes for expanding distance education are defined in other Commission documents. |
| RECOMMENDATION: nc |

| ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES: |

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2003 - 2004

YEAR FOR NEXT REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2013 - 2014

RECOMMENDATION: 2023-24
ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: 1018 Arkansas State University AR

TYPE OF REVIEW: PEAQ: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:

☒ No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs leading to Undergraduate</th>
<th>Program Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs leading to Graduate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificate programs

Certificate 9

Recommended Change:

Off-Campus Activities:

In State - Present Activity

Campuses: None.

Additional Locations:

Beebe Degree Center - Beebe, AR
AR Northeastern College Degree Center - Blytheville, AR
EACC Degree Center - Forrest City, AR
Mountain Home Degree Center - Mountain Home, AR
ASU-Newport - Newport, AR
Mid South Degree Center - West Memphis, AR

Recommended Change:
Out Of State - Present Activity
Campuses: None.
Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change:

Out of USA - Present Activity
Campuses: None.
Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change:

Distance Education Programs:
Present Offerings:
Associate 52.1201 Management Information Systems, General Associate of Science, Computer and Information Technology Major Internet

Associate 52.1201 Management Information Systems, General Associate of Science, Computer and Information Technology Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Bachelor of Science, Business Administration Major Internet

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Bachelor of Science, Business Administration Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Master 13.0301 Curriculum and Instruction Master of Science in Education, Curriculum and Instruction Major Internet

Master 13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, General Master of Science in Education, Special Education Instructional Specialist P-4 or 4-12 Internet

Master 13.04 Educational Administration and Supervision Master of Science in Education, Educational Leadership Major Internet

Bachelor 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse Bachelor of Science in Nursing, RN to BSN Program Internet

Bachelor 30.9999 Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other Bachelor of Applied Science Internet

Associate 15.9999 Engineering Technologies and Engineering-Related Fields, Other Associate of Science, Technology Major Internet

Bachelor 45.0401 Criminology Bachelor of Arts, Criminology Major Internet

Associate 24.0102 General Studies Associate of General Studies Internet
Associate 24.0101 Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies Enroute Associate of Arts, General Education Internet

Bachelor 38.0101 Philosophy Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy Major Internet

Bachelor 09.0100 Communication, General Bachelor of Arts, Communication Studies Major Internet

Bachelor 16.0101 Foreign Languages and Literatures, General Bachelor of Arts, World Languages and Cultures Major Internet

Bachelor 23.0101 English Language and Literature, General Bachelor of Arts, English Major Internet

Bachelor 40.0501 Chemistry, General Bachelor of Arts, Chemistry Major Internet

Bachelor 45.0601 Economics, General Bachelor of Art, Economics Major Internet

Bachelor 45.0601 Economics, General Bachelor of Art, Economics Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 45.0701 Geography Bachelor of Arts, Geography Major Internet

Bachelor 45.1001 Political Science and Government, General Bachelor of Arts, Political Science Major Internet

Bachelor 45.1101 Sociology Bachelor of Arts, Sociology Major Internet

Bachelor 54.0101 History, General Bachelor of Arts; History Major Internet

Bachelor 30.9999 Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other Bachelor of Science, Interdisciplinary Studies Major Internet

Bachelor 11.0301 Data Processing and Data Processing Technology/Technician Bachelor of Science, Computer Information Technology Major Internet

Bachelor 11.0301 Data Processing and Data Processing Technology/Technician Bachelor of Science, Computer Information Technology Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 15.9999 Engineering Technologies and Engineering-Related Fields, Other Bachelor of Science, Technology Major Internet

Bachelor 31.0501 Health and Physical Education/Fitness, General Bachelor of Science, Health Promotion Major Internet

Bachelor 31.0504 Sport and Fitness Administration/Management Bachelor of Science, Sport Management Major Internet

Master 23.0101 English Language and Literature, General Master of Arts, English Major Internet

Bachelor 51.3101 Dietetics/Dietitian Bachelor of Science, Nutritional Science Major Internet

Bachelor 52.0601 Business/Managerial Economics Bachelor of Science, Business Economics Major Internet
ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Bachelor 52.0601 Business/Managerial Economics Bachelor of Science, Business Economics Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 52.0801 Finance, General Bachelor of Science, Finance Internet

Bachelor 52.0801 Finance, General Bachelor of Science, Finance One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 52.1101 International Business/Trade/Commerce Bachelor of Science, International Business Major Internet

Bachelor 52.1101 International Business/Trade/Commerce Bachelor of Science, International Business Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Bachelor of Science, Management Major Internet

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Bachelor of Science, Management Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 01.0102 Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Agricultural Business Major Internet

Bachelor 01.0102 Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Agricultural Business Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 01.0901 Animal Sciences, General Bachelor of Science in Agriculture; Animal Science Major Internet

Bachelor 01.0901 Animal Sciences, General Bachelor of Science in Agriculture; Animal Science Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 01.1101 Plant Sciences, General Bachelor of Science in Agriculture; Plant and Soil Science Major Internet

Bachelor 01.1101 Plant Sciences, General Bachelor of Science in Agriculture; Plant and Soil Science Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 44.0701 Social Work Bachelor of Social Work Internet

Bachelor 44.0701 Social Work Bachelor of Social Work One-way or Two Way Transmission

Master 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Master of Business Administration Internet

Master 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Master of Business Administration One-way or Two Way Transmission

Master 44.0401 Public Administration Master of Public Administration Internet

Specialist 13.0401 Educational Leadership and Administration, General Specialist in Education,
ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Educational Leadership Major Internet

Master 31.0504 Sport and Fitness Administration/Management Master of Science, Sport Administration Major Internet

Master 31.0505 Kinesiology and Exercise Science Master of Science, Exercise Science Major Internet

Master 13.1102 College Student Counseling and Personnel Services Master of Science, College Student Personnel Services Major Internet

Master 19.0708 Child Care and Support Services Management Master of Science, Early Childhood Services Major Internet

Master 54.0101 History, General Master of Arts, History Major Internet

Specialist 13.1299 Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Levels and Methods, Other Specialist in Community College Teaching Internet

Master 43.0104 Criminal Justice/Safety Studies Master of Arts, Criminal Justice Major Internet

Master 45.1101 Sociology Master of Arts, Sociology Major Internet

Bachelor 52.0301 Accounting Bachelor of Science, Accounting Major Internet

Bachelor 52.0301 Accounting Bachelor of Science, Accounting Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Master 51.9999 Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences, Other Master of Science, Health Sciences Major Internet

Master 52.0301 Accounting Master of Accountancy Internet

Master 52.0301 Accounting Master of Accountancy One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 52.1401 Marketing/Marketing Management, General Bachelor of Science, Marketing Major Internet

Bachelor 52.1401 Marketing/Marketing Management, General Bachelor of Science, Marketing Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 50.0501 Drama and Dramatics/Theatre Arts, General Bachelor of Arts, Theatre Major Internet

Bachelor 09.0401 Journalism Bachelor of Science, Journalism Major Internet

Bachelor 09.0701 Radio and Television Bachelor of Science, Radio-Television Major Internet

Bachelor 50.0701 Art/Art Studies, General Bachelor of Arts; Art Major Internet

Bachelor 50.0901 Music, General Bachelor of Arts; Music Major Internet
Bachelor 51.1005 Clinical Laboratory Science/Medical Technology/Technologist Bachelor of Science, Clinical Laboratory Sciences Major Internet

Bachelor 51.0913 Athletic Training/Trainer Bachelor of Science, Athletic Training Major Internet

Bachelor 42.0101 Psychology, General Bachelor of Science, Psychology Major Internet

Bachelor 01.0102 Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Agricultural Studies Major Internet

Bachelor 01.0102 Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Agricultural Studies Major One-way or Two Way Transmission

Bachelor 11.0101 Computer and Information Sciences, General Bachelor of Arts, Computer Science Major Internet

Bachelor 13.1317 Social Science Teacher Education Bachelor of Science in Education, Social Science Major Internet

Master 45.1001 Political Science and Government, General Master of Arts, Political Science Major Internet

Associate 24.0101 Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies Enroute Associate of Science, General Education Internet

Master 13.0301 Curriculum and Instruction Master of Science in Education, Educational Theory and Practice Major Internet

**Recommended Change:**

**Correspondence Education Programs:**

Present Offerings:
None.

**Recommended Change:**

**Contractual Relationships:**

Present Offerings:
None.

**Recommended Change:**

**Consortial Relationships:**

Present Offerings:
None.
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Recommended Change: