Utica College

Academic Assessment Plan

November 2012

Table of Contents

From the Provost 1

Academic Assessment at Utica College 2

Definitions 3

1. Division-level operational goals 5

2. Institution-Level Student Learning Assessment 6

3. Program Level Assessment 7
   3.A. Program-level student learning goals 7
   3.B. Program-level operational goals 7
   3.C. Five-year program reviews 8

4. Course Level Assessment 9
   4.A. Course-level Student Learning Goals 9
   4.B. Course-level Operational Goals 10

Appendices 11
   Appendix A – General Education Goal Rotation Schedule 12
   Appendix B – Budget Calendar 14
   Appendix C - Program Review Schedule 15

From the Provost

Utica College's strategic plan is founded on a commitment to academic programs of the highest quality. In order to build towards this goal we need to know how well we are doing. This Academic Assessment Plan lays out the processes by which we determine where we are succeeding and where we need to improve, and covers the assessment of both student learning and institutional effectiveness. It contains both a description of the processes as they currently exist, and steps we need to take for the future. It is by its nature a living document that will evolve as we learn more about how to do what we do well.

We know that effective assessment is non-punitive, inclusive, and useful, providing academic programs the information they need to continue to offer academic high quality programs. Assessment needs to have both formative and summative elements and be a component part of an iterative cycle of understanding where we are and planning for how to do better.

For these reasons academic assessment at Utica College is overseen by the Academic Assessment Coordinating Committee, assisted by the Office of Academic Assessment and the Director of Academic Assessment; the assessment plan is our plan created by the faculty and administration of Academic Affairs in a way that allows us to reflect on what we do well and plan effectively to do even better; and the academic administration is committed to using assessment information in a non punitive way to help guide the College's effective operation and the improvement of our students' learning.

Judith Kirkpatrick
Provost
Utica College
October 2012

Academic Assessment at Utica College

Academic assessment at Utica College takes place within the context of the Institutional Assessment Plan and is consistent with the Guiding Principles laid out in that document. In brief those principles are that assessment will be:

1. Under the control of the faculty and staff in the specific area
2. Realistic
3. Ongoing and tied to the mission and strategic plan
4. Utilize multiple methods that are reliable and valid
5. Documented
6. Useful and produce results that are actually used for planning and budgeting
7. Driven by a plan that is periodically reviewed.

Utica College's Academic Assessment Plan provides both operational and strategic direction for the assessment of student learning and operational effectiveness within the Division of Academic Affairs. Other documents provide direction for assessment in other divisions. The plan is reviewed by the Assessment Committee every three years and recommendations to address processes and procedures that will improve its effectiveness are forwarded to the Provost.

While the Provost is ultimately responsible for assessment within academic affairs, the Office of Academic Assessment maintains the assessment processes within Academic Affairs and the Academic Assessment Coordinating Committee provides coordination and oversight through its policies and procedures. A more detailed description of the assessment committee and its charge is found within the AACC Policies and Procedures Handbook in the password protected section of the UC Information for Faculty web pages.

Academic Assessment at Utica College focuses on both operational effectiveness at the division and program level and student learning at the institutional, programmatic, and course-specific levels. Division-level operational effectiveness assessment is carried out in response to the goals established by the provost's cabinet while program level operational effectiveness assessment responds to operational goals established by individual academic programs. The assessment is carried out by various offices and programs reporting through academic affairs and information is disseminated in regular reports and utilized in decision making. Student learning assessment is organized around student learning goals at the institutional, programmatic, and course-specific level. Each level has a unique process for identifying the student learning goals, gathering direct evidence of student learning, sharing the results, closing the loop, making improvements and linking the results to resource allocations.

Definitions

General Terms

Assessment – The measure of the extent to which certain goals have been met. Different from **Evaluation** which assigns a value to the progress made towards meeting certain goals. For instance, it is an assessment that x% of students can perform y types of mathematical calculations; it is an evaluation when we determine that that level is or is not good enough.

Course Syllabus – A document that lays out the expectations, including the learning goals, for a single course.

Curriculum map – a document that lays out the program-level student learning goals and then identifies in which course each goal is met.

Direct Measure – clear, visible, convincing and specific evidence of learning. *Examples*: test, quiz, examinations, internship performance, capstone projects, exhibits, performances, pass rates on licensure or certification tests, employer rating of students' performance. What is being measured needs to be precisely and clearly defined and the measure used needs to give specific information about what is being measured.

Indirect Measure – used to support findings from direct measures. *Examples*: course evaluations, number of hours spent on intellectual activities related to the course, enrollment data, alumni surveys, student opinion surveys, graduation rates, course grades…

Institutional Assessment Plan – documented plan outlining the assessment and institutional effectiveness framework for the entire College.

Specific Processes at Utica College

Course Level Assessment – two distinct assessment processes: student learning assessment and operational goal assessment.

> **Course Student Learning Goals (CSLG)** – the measurable learning/knowledge expectations for all students completing an academic course; documented in the syllabi and program review documents. Direct measures are to be used; indirect measures/results will be used to support the direct measure findings. CSGL are identified by faculty, described in the course syllabus, and it is the faculty of each course who determine what to measure and the tool to use for this faculty-driven process.
>
> **Course Operational Goals** –focus on the functioning of the course, rather than the learning achieved by the students. Examples include development of new courses, deletion of a course, edits to a course, and course mapping to program goals.

Academic Program – According to NYS Education Department, an academic program is organized around the set of educational requirements necessary to qualify for a registered degree. The curriculum or program includes general education or specialized study in depth in a particular field, or both (NYSED, 2012). At Utica College academic departments may contain more than one registered program. In some cases it may be operationally effective for the documented program review to focus on one department and all its academic programs. If a department would like to consolidate the program review process of more than one academic program under one academic department, it must first send in writing a request to the Academic Assessment Coordinating Committee (AACC) for approval.

Program Level Assessment – assessment of the student learning or operational functioning at the program level.

> **Program Student Learning Goals (PSLG) –** the measurable learning/knowledge expectations for all students graduating from a particular curriculum/major; documented in the catalog, web site, and program review documents. Minimum one PSLG is assessed by the program each year. Direct measures are to be used; indirect measures/results will be used to support the direct measure findings. Faculty of the program identify PSGL's and facilitate the process.
>
> **Program Operational Goals** – Goals set for and by a program, usually during the five-year program review process. However operational goals may be set during a review for an external accreditor or in the interim between program reviews. Operational goals address the functioning of the program.

Program Review – required self-study process completed by each academic program. It is usually conducted on a five-year rotation, unless external program accreditation cycles require a different review time line.

Syllabi Format and Submission - faculty are required to follow the established course syllabi template adopted by the Curriculum Committee. All syllabi are submitted to the respective School and are reviewed to ensure course student learning goals are communicated and discernible.

Division-Level Academic Assessment – assessment of the division-level operational goals. These are developed by the Provost's cabinet during the annual retreat. Results are communicated annually to the Office of the President. This process also makes use of **Academic Affairs Data –** include the key performance indicators used for the Institution Dashboard Report, the Core Audit Report, the Program Quality Analysis, and the Academic Admissions Report.

Institution-Level Assessment – focuses on both the Institutional Priorities and Institution Level Student Learning Goals.

> **Institutional Priorities** – based upon the divisional goals developed by members of the President's Cabinet in collaboration with their respective areas. In consultation with the Board of Trustees the college President identifies the College's institutional priorities for the year. All goals are linked directly to the College's Strategic Plan. The President reports annually to the College community on progress made towards meeting the previous year's institutional priorities.
>
> **Institutional Student Learning Goals –** the measurable learning expectations for all students graduating from any academic program. The 10 General Education goals are Utica College's institutional student learning goals which are assessed using direct measures are to be used while indirect measures/results will be used to support the direct measure findings. These are established by the institution with input from the faculty and academic administration. The Academic Assessment Coordinating Committee coordinates the process which occurs whether or not assessment is identified as an institutional priority.

1. Division-level operational goals

The division-level operational goals are developed by the Provost's cabinet at the annual retreat. Division-level academic assessment is but one of many campus-based division assessments that serve the institution-level of decision making and institutional effectiveness.

1.1 Direct Measures

The Office of Academic Affairs implements numerous assessments of the academic programs (instructional and non-instructional) and operational processes at the College. These include contribution of data for the Institution Dashboard Report, and the creation of the CORE Audit Report, the Program Quality Analysis, and the Academic Admissions Report.

1.2. Schedule

Each Academic Affairs report is completed on an annual or semester basis, as warranted.

1.3. Collecting the data and sharing the results

The Office of Academic Affairs gathers the data needed for the reports. The results are sent to the various offices that utilize the results for planning and reporting purposes, and/or the results are posted internally for the campus to view.

1.4. Closing the Loop

The Provost's Cabinet uses the report data to annually update goal progress, as well as progress made on Strategic Plan initiatives. This is documented in a report that is sent to the College President. Each summer a retreat is held to review all areas of the College and their progress on operational goals as they relate to the Strategic Plan. The President's Cabinet reviews the results during the retreat with the goal of developing and articulating Institutional Priorities for the coming year.

1.5. Linked to Budget

The Provost's office uses the Academic Affairs data, the Strategic Plan, and Institutional Priorities to support budget requests. The college budget committee is responsible for documenting the use of assessment results linked to budget decisions and resource allocations.

1.6 Sustaining the Process

This process is sustained as part of the Institutional Assessment Plan. The Associate Provost works with various areas of Academic Affairs to ensure the data is collected and the reports are shared as scheduled.

2. Institution-Level Student Learning Assessment

Student learning goals at the institution level have been identified by the faculty, were vetted through the faculty senate in 2002 and integrated into the College's CORE curriculum in 2004. The general education goals are located at http://www.utica.edu/academic/goals.cfm.

2.1 Direct Measures:

Each institutional-level general education goal is directly assessed by a rubric. The rubric has been developed through an inclusive process where college faculty volunteered to design and test the rubric for each general education goal.

2.2 Schedule:

Each general education goal has been placed on a rotating schedule for assessment. Please see Appendix A.

2.3 Collecting the data and sharing the results:

The Director of Academic Assessment is responsible for collecting and disseminating the results to the campus constituents. These include reports to the faculty senate, AACC, and college executives. A visual summary is created and posted internally for future reference and planning purposes.

2.4 Closing the loop:

Responsibility for reviewing and taking action on institution-level assessment results is shared across a number of bodies:

- The AACC is responsible for reviewing the institution-level student learning assessment process and producing semi-annual reports that summarize the results of that process.
- The general education goal work groups review the processes associated with their specific goal and recommend any necessary changes to the AACC.
- The Academic Standards Committee is responsible for reviewing reports of institution level student learning outcomes, identifying reasonable benchmarks for achievement, and recommending action to the Faculty Senate and academic administration.
- The Office of Academic Affairs, including the Provost and the Provost's cabinet, reviews institutional-level assessment results, identifies any issues, and refers them to the appropriate college entity including other College offices or bodies.

Each responsible body documents actions taken in their minutes which are stored on the College's shared drive.

2.5 Linked to budget

The Director of Academic Assessment is responsible for compiling annual reports on institutional-level student learning assessment results for use in the budget formation process. The Provost, as a member of the College's budget committee, is responsible for bringing assessment information to the budget formation process. The college budget committee is responsible for documenting the use of assessment results linked to budget decisions and resource allocations. Please see the budget timeline in Appendix B.

2.6 Sustaining the Institutional Level Student Learning Assessment Process

The AACC, in conjunction with the Director of Academic Assessment, works collaboratively to facilitate the institutional level academic assessment model. The process is reviewed continuously to improve all aspects of the model. The Office of Academic Assessment has the responsibility to annually document the process, results, and disseminate the data to the appropriate units or committees.

3. Program Level Assessment

There are two distinct assessment processes at the academic program level. One captures data from direct measures used to assess student learning within each academic program; the other involves annually assessment by the program of its operational goals.

3.A. Program-level student learning goals

Student learning goals at this level are identified and documented by the faculty. Many programs hold external accreditation that also require and approve student learning goals for the respective academic program. Faculty review these goals at the time of the program review, which is usually every five years or when the program is reaccredited. Program-level student learning goals are communicated to students via the College's website and the college catalog.

3.A.1. Direct Measures

Program faculty are responsible for identifying program-level student learning goals, determining the assessment mechanisms most appropriate, and documenting the results. Faculty of each program have the flexibility to assess as many student learning goals as needed and they have the flexibility to assess the same goal(s) in consecutive years.

3.A.2. Schedule

Annually, a minimum of one program-level student learning goal is assessed by the faculty of the program with resulting actions identified.

3.A.3. Collecting the data and sharing the results

Findings are documented each fall semester on the Program-level Student Learning Goals form (see AACC handbook appendix 5) and submitted to the respective school dean for review by October 15. Generally, the academic program chair will complete this documentation. The Director of Academic Assessment collects this form and the dean's response for archival purposes and future reference.

3.A.4. Closing the Loop

The School Dean meets annually with the programs/departments to discuss the results of the assessment and plan the resulting actions. The Dean documents the results of the meeting. Annual goal documents, student learning assessment documents, and other assessment documentation generated by the process are stored in an electronic form by the Director of Academic Assessment on the College's designated storage devices. Departmental-level Student Learning Goal assessment results are summarized in the five-year program review.

3.A.5. Linked to budget

The school dean uses program-level student learning goal assessment results to support budget requests at the program level. The college budget committee is responsible for documenting the use of assessment results linked to budget decisions and resource allocations.

3.A.6. Sustaining the Process

As needed, the Director of Academic Assessment meets with department chairs to explain the annual assessment activities for the college, and provides professional guidance and development opportunities. The Department chairs Handbook provides information on annual assessment activities, documentation, and guidance about assessing student learning goals. Any recommendations for amendments to the process are included in the report by the Director of Academic Assessment to AACC.

3.B. Program-level operational goals

The program-level operational goals are usually developed as a result of the five-year program review process as outlined by the AACC and are continually assessed in-between the five-year program review process.

3.B.1 Direct Measures
Directors in collaboration with department chairs determine the measures to be used for operational goals.

3.B.2. Schedule
Annually, program-level operational goals are assessed by the faculty of the program with resulting actions identified.

3.B.3. Collecting the data and sharing the results
Program-level operation goals at this level are identified and documented by the faculty of the program.

3.B.4. Closing the Loop
Faculty of the program annually document actions taken based upon assessment results. These are shared with the respective school dean and archived by the Office of Academic Assessment.

3.B.5. Linked to Budget
The school dean uses program operational goal reports to support budget requests at the program level. The college budget committee is responsible for documenting the use of assessment results linked to budget decisions and resource allocations.

3.B.6 Sustaining the Process
As needed, the Director of Academic Assessment meets with department chairs to explain the annual assessment activities for the college, and provides professional guidance and development opportunities. The Department chairs Handbook provides information on annual assessment activities, documentation, and guidance about assessing operational goals. Any recommendations for amendments to the process are included in the report by the Director of Academic Assessment to AACC.

3.C. Five-year program reviews
Details of the five-program review process and its required documentation are located within the Information for Faculty section of the UC web page. This page is a password-protected page with information, forms, and links for academic department chairs, including curriculum committee forms, and program review and annual update forms. It can be found here: https://www.utica.edu/academic/facultyinfo/

3.C.1 Measures
The five-year program review process includes use of direct and indirect measures. These include, but are not limited to, program-level student learning goal results, program-level operation goal results, external accreditation review, student surveys, and institutional research data about graduation rates, retention rates, and enrollment.

3.C.2. Schedule
Five-year program reviews will be due in the fall of the academic year five years from the academic year in which the committee completed its deliberation of the prior review. Please see Appendix C for the schedule.

3.C.3. Collecting the data and sharing the results
AACC is responsible for facilitating the five-year program review process. Faculty of the academic programs have the responsibility to gather and report the findings in the five-year program review document for submission to AACC. A full description of this step-by-step process is included in the AACC Policies and Procedures Handbook.

3.C.4. Closing the Loop

Following the program review process, each academic program is invited to meet with the Provost for a close-the-loop discussion about the program review findings. If necessary, action plans are identified at this time.

3.C.5. Linked to Budget
The school dean uses program review findings to support budget requests from the program level. The college budget committee is responsible for documenting the use of assessment results linked to budget decisions and resource allocations.

3.C.6 Sustaining the Process
A detailed description of how the five-year program review process is sustained can be found in the AACC Policies and Procedures Handbook.

4. Course Level Assessment
As with program level assessment, there are two distinct assessment processes at the course level. One captures data from direct measures used to assess student learning within each academic course; the other involves the operational processes in place to develop and maintain courses within an academic program.

4.A. Course-level Student Learning Goals
Faculty have the responsibility to directly measure and document student learning goals at the course level. A course syllabus is required from each faculty and is expected to be submitted to the respective school office for archival purposes. This follows the College's Curriculum Committee guidelines, "What should be in a syllabus?" found here: http://www.utica.edu/academic/facultyinfo/curriculum.cfm

4.A.1 Direct Measures:
Course level assessments include direct measures identified by each individual faculty member.

4.A.2 Schedule:
Course-level student learning goals are not on a specified schedule. Faculty have the freedom to assess at the course level as he/she deems appropriate.

4.A.3 Collecting the data and sharing the results:
Faculty document the course assessment data individually. It is expected that academic programs will meet to engage in conversations about student learning at the course level and the direct relationship these results have with the program-level student learning goals. Many departments find it most efficient to align course-level assessment with the department-level goal so that the department level assessment can be informed by assessment at the course level.

4.A.4 Closing the loop:
While it is not required, many academic programs provide a common "retreat" activity to discuss the respective academic program. This often includes conversations about student learning goals at the course level. When programs have aligned course and program level assessment, documentation can include both levels and any resulting actions.

4.A.5 Linked to budget:
Course-level student learning goal assessment results are part of the support related to program level budget requests, as needed. See also 2.5 above.

4.A.6 Sustaining the Course Level Student Learning Assessment Process
This level of the student learning assessment is the responsibility of the faculty. Follow-up on course syllabi is facilitated by the school offices. Adjunct faculty are provided the syllabus

guidelines as a reference and the Office of Academic Assessment provide support for professional development related to writing student learning goals.

4.B. Course-level Operational Goals

The assessment of the operational goals at the course level takes place at various stages. These include developing new courses, deletion of a course, changes to a course, and course mapping to program goals.

4.B.1 Measures

Various measures are used for course-level operational assessment. The majority of these assessments occur at key points as a course evolves. A standard course syllabi template is required for all new courses. Protocols, processes, and forms are used by the Curriculum Committee as outlined in UC's Curriculum Committee Source Book, beginning on page seven and found here:
http://www.utica.edu/academic/facultyinfo/media/Curriculum_Committee_Source_Book_2012-Sept.pdf
Course mapping or curriculum mapping to program goals is completed and assessed primarily when the academic program is completing the program review process.

4.B.2. Schedule

Course development, deletion, and revisions are completed on a rolling basis throughout the academic year. Course mapping or curriculum mapping is aligned with the program's review cycle.

4.B.3. Collecting the data and sharing the results

The Curriculum Committee maintains all records pertaining to course additions, edits, and deletions. The Curriculum Committee informs the campus via Faculty Senate meetings and shared committee minutes. The Office of Academic Assessment archives all courses mapped to programs. These are available for use in program reviews or for support of curriculum revision proposals.

4.B.4. Closing the Loop

Periodically, the Curriculum Committee reviews and revises the procedures related to course development and the syllabus template. All changes and updates are shared with the college and posted to the Curriculum Committee web page.

4.B.5. Linked to Budget

The school deans will review course needs to support documented budget requests.

4.B.6 Sustaining the Process

This process is sustained as part of the Curriculum Committee's charge and as part of the Academic Assessment charge identified in the AACC Policies and Procedures Handbook. Any recommendations for amendments to the process are identified by the Curriculum Committee or Office of Academic Assessment and AACC.

Appendices

Appendix A – General Education Goal Rotation Schedule

Assessment of General Education
As of March 2012

G.E. Goal	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
College-wide						
Goal 1 Written Comm.	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Goal 7 Critical Thinking	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement
Departmental						
Goal 3 Foreign Language	Development	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 4 Quantitative Re.	Development	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 5 Computer Tech.	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Course specific						
Goal 2 Oral Comm.	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement
Goal 6 Humanities	Development	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 8 Scientific Method	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Goal 9 Social Sciences	Development	Development	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 10 Diversity	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement

G.E. Goal	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
College-wide						
Goal 1 Written Comm.	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Goal 7 Critical Thinking	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement
Departmental						
Goal 3 Foreign Language	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 4 Quantitative Re.	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 5 Computer Tech.	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Course specific						
Goal 2 Oral Comm.	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement
Goal 6 Humanities	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 8 Scientific Method	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze
Goal 9 Social Sciences	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data
Goal 10 Diversity	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement	Collect Data	Analyze	Implement

Appendix B – Budget Calendar

Utica College Budget Calendar *As of Sept. 2012*	
Mid-fall	Budget Templates forwarded to budget managers (including School Deans).
End of December	Budget managers build budgets in collaboration with academic Directors and Department Chairs. Assessment results are used, where appropriate, to justify budget requests.
January - March	Budget committee reviews departmental budgets and documents resource allocations supported by assessment results.
May	Budget approved by Board of Trustees.

Appendix C - Program Review Schedule

As of Nov. 5, 2012

AACC Master Program Review Schedule			
Program	**Last review**	**Due Oct. 15, 2013**	**notes**
Biology	09	2013	
Cybersecurity & Info Assurance		2013	NSA 2013-14?
Cybersecurity Intel Forensics		2013	NSA 2013-14?
Foreign Languages	02	2013	
Geoscience	new	2013	
Gerontology	02-03	2013	
Physics	03	2013	
PPt DPT		2013	
		Due Oct. 15, 2014	
Business-Economics	07-08	2014	Expected External Accreditor
Communications Arts	09	2014	CAPA memo 2009 PR dated 2008
ECM – MS online		2014	
Econ Crim/ Fraud Mgmt- MBA	08-09	2014	Expected External Accreditor
Journalism	08-09	2014	
Liberal Studies MS		2014	
Mathematics	07-08	2014	CAPA mtg 2008
Occupational Therapy	08-09	2014	External Accreditor due 2013; 7 or 10 yr cycle
Public Relations	08-09	2014	
Public Relations/Journalism		2014	
Therapeutic Recreation	03-04	2014	
		Due Oct. 15, 2015	
Accounting	07-08	2015	Expected External Accreditor
Bio - Chemistry	09	2015	
Chemistry	04	2015	Expect external completion fall 2014
CJ- ECI		2015	
Government & Politics	09-10	2015	External Review
Health Care Admin	new	2015	
Health Studies	08-09	2015	
International Studies		2015	
Management	07-08	2015	Expected External Accreditor
Psychology	09	2015	CAPA mtg 2009

Program	Last review	Due Oct. 15, 2016	notes
Construction Management	10-11	2016	External Accreditor
Education Leadership		2016	2010 TEAC requested mid-report 2015
English	09	2016	CAPA notes 2009
Health Studies-Management	09-10	2016	Expected External Accreditor
History	09-10	2016	PR dated 2009 CAPA doc dated 2010
Nursing	11-12	2016	CCNE External Accreditor 2010; next 2015, then 10 yrs.
Physical Therapy	11-12	2016	CAPTE External Accreditor 2013
Risk Management & Insurance	07-08	2016	Transition- new hire Expected External Accreditor
Sociology/Anthropology	10	2016	PR dated 2010 Provost memo 2010
		Due Oct. 15, 2017	
Computer Science	10	2017	Outside reviewer dated 2010
Criminal Justice	11-12	2017	
Homeland Sec. & Emer. Mgt.	new	2017	
Liberal Studies-BS	10	2017	CAPA comments draft - 2010
Philosophy	08	2017	Provost memo 2008
Psychology-Child Life	10-11	2017	
		Due Oct. 15, 2018	
Education Program	TEAC (2010) 2012	2018	TEAC 2010; next due 2017
Professional Accountancy MBA	new	2018	