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Background on Quality Checkups conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement Program

The Higher Learning Commission’s Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) conducts Quality Checkup site visits to each institution during the fifth or sixth year in every seven-year cycle of AQIP participation. These visits are conducted by trained, experienced AQIP Reviewers to determine whether the institution continues to meet The Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation, and whether it is using quality management principles and building a culture of continuous improvement as participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) requires. The goals of an AQIP Quality Checkup are to:

1. Affirm the accuracy of the organization’s online Systems Portfolio and verify information included in the portfolio that the last Systems Appraisal has identified as needing clarification or verification (System Portfolio Clarification and Verification), including review of distance delivery and distributed education if the institution is so engaged.
2. Review with organizational leaders actions taken to capitalize on the strategic issues and opportunities for improvement identified by the last Systems Appraisal (Systems Appraisal Follow Up);
3. Alert the organization to areas that need its attention prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation, and reassure it concerning areas that have been covered adequately (Accreditation Issues Follow Up);
4. Verify federal compliance issues such as default rates, complaints, USDE interactions and program reviews, etc. (Federal Compliance Review); and
5. Assure continuing organizational quality improvement commitment through presentations, meetings, or sessions that clarify AQIP and Commission accreditation work (Organizational Quality Commitment).

The AQIP peer reviewer(s) trained for this role prepare for the visit by reviewing relevant organizational and AQIP file materials, particularly the organization’s last Systems Appraisal Feedback Report and the Commission’s internal Organizational Profile, which summarizes information reported by the institution in its Annual Institutional Data Update. The report provided to AQIP by the institution is also shared with the evaluator(s). Copies of the Quality Checkup report are provided to the institution’s CEO and AQIP liaison. The Commission retains a copy in the institution’s permanent file, and will be part of the materials reviewed by the AQIP Review Panel during Reaffirmation of Accreditation.
Clarification and verification of contents of the institution’s Systems Portfolio

The Quality Checkup Team reviewed the 2012 Systems Portfolio before arriving for the Quality Checkup visit, as well as related documents provided by Southeast Missouri State University (SMSU). The 2012 System Portfolio often provided specific examples of processes and results that led to changes and improvement at the institution. During the visit the Team met with the, President, Provost, and the Executive Staff, the AQIP Steering Committee, and other key administrators, faculty, staff, and students in order to discuss the System Portfolio and learn more about the culture of quality and continuous improvement at the University. These meetings permitted to the Team to clarify and verify information in the System Portfolio. For example, the Team learned that the AQIP Steering Committee coordinated the process of having SMSU address each of the “O” and “OO” comments from the 2010 System Appraisal. The institutional responses to these concerns included presenting missing evidence, articulating the processes already in place, and explicitly identifying examples of institutional “Plan Do Check Act” processes that close the loop. In another example, the Team had informative conversations with the leaders of current and completed Action Projects and verified how these Projects arose, developed, and aided the institution. Discussions with key administrators identified multiple examples of initiatives that utilize the cycle of Plan-Do-Check-Act. The Team’s conversations during the visit identified similar stories, processes, and themes among units at SMSU and across faculty, administrators, and students. 

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with the Commission’s standards and AQIP’s expectations.

Review of the organization’s quality assurance oversight of its distance education activities.

During the Quality Checkup visit the Team met with the Associate Dean of Distance and Online Learning and the staff that support distance education to learn more about the processes, policies, and practices for distance learning at Southeast Missouri State University. The Team learned that online courses are developed and offered within established campus-based academic departments. These online courses are held to the same rigor as analogous courses that are taught face-to-face on campus. Review of example syllabi confirmed that Student Learning Outcomes were the same between the traditional and online versions of a course, and required activities and assignments were similar, as was the required workload (i.e., hours required for the course). Impressively, full-time campus faculty teach most of SMSU’s online courses with less than 10% taught by adjunct professors. Additionally, the Team’s conversation with staff who are responsible for supporting distance learning highlighted proactive advising for students.
taking online classes, good support for faculty as they develop online versions of courses, and helpful technical assistance to enable faculty to effectively use the Learning Management System. Issues such as interactivity and social presence, copyright, ADA compliance, and others specific to online have been addressed by policy and processes incorporated into the delivery systems for distance education. Online courses appear to be an integrated part of the educational experience that SMSU offers to students.

*In the team’s judgment, the institution has presented satisfactory evidence that its distance education activities are acceptable and comply with the Commission’s standards and expectations.*

**Review of the organization’s quality assurance and oversight of distributed education (multiple campuses, additional locations, off-campus course sites)**

During the Quality Checkup visit the Team met with the directors of the three regional campuses (Kennett, Malden, & Sikeston) to learn about the operation, practices, and policies for these sites. The Team found that Southeast Missouri State University’s regional campus site operations mirror operations on the main campus. For example, the regional campuses include resident faculty, lab facilities, and academic programs and courses that are integrated with the main campus academic departments. Additionally, SMSU strives to promote interactions between regional and main campuses, for instance through daily courier/mail service, visits by Admissions or Financial Aid Staff to the regional campuses, and visits to academic departments, the bookstore, and the registrar by the regional directors. Leadership from the regional campuses demonstrated a deep understanding of the issues and concerns identified by each local community from which SMSU draws its students. Regional campuses also are supported by their respective communities, as evidenced by successful local funding for several ongoing initiatives.

*In the team’s judgment, the institution has presented satisfactory evidence that its distributed education activities (operation of multiple campuses, additional locations, off-campus course sites) are acceptable and comply with Commission’s standards and expectations.*

**Review of specific accreditation issues identified by the institution’s last Systems Appraisal**

There were no accreditation issues raised by the last Systems Appraisal and the Team did not identify accreditation issues during the Quality Checkup visit.

*In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.*
Review of the institution’s approach to capitalizing on recommendations identified by its last Systems Appraisal in the Strategic Issues Analysis.

The 2010 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report for Southeast Missouri State University described several strategic issues including:

- A careful analysis of information gathered through feedback instruments, coupled with institution-wide discussion about the impact of the information on operations, services, and people, to produce meaningful results.
- Continue to build a culture of data-based decision-making that closes the gap between targeted improvements and planning processes at all levels and among all units and sub-units of SMSU.
- Further development of efforts to increase employee satisfaction, including processes to measure employee needs related to non-instructional goal, to incorporate these needs in budgetary planning, and to identify measurable outcomes for these processes.
- Development of a comprehensive plan to encourage all employees to pursue training and mentoring opportunities, including encouraging women and minorities to pursue leadership training and mentoring opportunities.
- Development of processes to connect data from various measures of student and stakeholder experiences to important university initiatives, for example by creating a process to define, document, and communicate expectations for effective teaching and learning.
- Harness existing assessment tools and plans to identify measures, apply and analyze those measures, and determine what improvements are needed in order to provoke change in curriculum and teaching.

During the Quality Checkup visit, meetings with the Executive Team, other administrators, the AQIP Steering Committee, Action Project leaders, and students, faculty and staff indicated that Southeast Missouri State University is making progress on each of these strategic issues. For example, the Budget Review process stands out as a significant proactive move by the university and its leadership in the face of continuing state funding issues and state mandates in education performance. The process is transparent and provides opportunities for SMSU to incorporate the needs of employees into budgetary planning. The Team learned of examples of the institution’s efforts to collect, analyze, and use data to inform decision-making and produce meaningful results. For instance the Plan Do Check Act cycle is now incorporated into all quality improvement processes in order to close the loop, including examples from academic units (i.e., Action Project on basic algebra; Academic Program Review Process) and
Several Action Projects and Quick Quip projects (i.e., projects that address issues that are time sensitive or where the full AQIP Action Project is not feasible or desirable), address specific strategic issues such as updating the faculty handbook to explicitly separate policy and procedure, or developing a process for academic planning and assessment that includes articulating Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) in every course and determining the means to measure these SLOs. Additionally, the AQIP Steering Committee has worked to review all “O” and “OO” statements in the 2010 Systems Appraisal, addressing every issue, and in the process turning some of those issues into Strategic Strengths. SMSU is encouraged to continue seeking AQIP Action Projects from broad spectrum of organizations, units, and committees within the overall institution. SMSU is also encouraged to continue the process of developing an integrated office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

Review of organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement

Southeast Missouri State University demonstrates a commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement from the top level, through administrators and staff, across the faculty, and among the students:

- The Team met with the President and found a strong understanding of the strengths, challenges, and opportunities facing SMSU, coupled to a commitment to data-informed planning and decision-making.
- Meetings with the Provost and other top administrators provided examples of initiatives aligned with AQIP processes and that use the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle, such as the Budget Review Process, the Academic Program Review process, and the Planning and Unit Assessment Process.
- The AQIP Steering Committee provides guidance for many of institution’s quality improvement efforts, including responding to opportunities and strategy issues from the 2010 Systems Appraisal.
- The use of Action Projects, Quick Quip projects, and the PDCA cycle demonstrate SMSU’s engagement in the quality journey.
- In open forums or meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, and students it was evident that a culture of quality improvement is becoming integrated into the campus culture. This culture
involves a wide variety of people, including students, who actively engage in Action Projects, Quick Quip projects, the PDCA cycle, and who consider feedback from collected data as important to their decision-making processes. Throughout the site visit, the members of the institution presented evidence of how improvement in various areas was the result of quality improvement thinking.

*In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.*

**Other AQIP issues**

Southeast Missouri State University hosted an informative and efficient visit for Quality Checkup Team. In meals or meetings with faculty, students, staff, and senior administrators the Team found that participants were informed about the AQIP process and they thought the process provided a structure and more mindful framework for continuous improvement at SMSU, focusing efforts that were already happening. Participants were able to clearly describe SMSU’s strengths and assets, and they could identify the overall challenges facing the institution as well as challenges facing particular groups (i.e., students, staff, faculty). Participants were confident about the future of SMSU and in its role in educating students and becoming a “University of First Choice” for students, faculty, staff, and employers.

Southeast Missouri State University has developed a strong culture of quality improvement. The benefits of this culture of improvement at SMSU are evident in the completed and current Action Projects. For instance, the project on Improving Students’ Basic Algebra Skills, demonstrated the use of cycles of Plan-Do-Check-Act to produce improvement in student learning across iterations of course development for Beginning Algebra/Intermediate Algebra. Indeed, though the course did not produce significant improvement after the first of iteration, SMSU took advantage of feedback and learning to create changes that produced significant results in the next iterations of the course. A current project on Course Redesign employs PDCA cycles as instructors make a five semester commitment to redesign a entire course with the aim of increasing student learning while creating efficiencies in how course materials are made available to students and in how students engage with those materials. The Team also notes that continuous improvement processes have informed recent and on-going planning at SMSU, such as the recent infrastructure review and facilities management plan and the University 2020 process that is targeted at academic planning. The Team concludes that Southeast Missouri State University is setting the stage for future success and improvement.
Appendix A

Worksheet for The Evaluation Team on Federal Compliance Requirements

Instructions: The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. 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 this AQIP Quality Checkup Report. This Worksheet must be completed for all Quality Checkup visits after January 1, 2012.

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team:

Reviewed Federal Compliance Packet
Undergraduate Bulletin 2012-2013
OMB-133 Report
2011 Financial Statements, Auditors letters and Management Comments
Student Complaint and Concerns Log – Appendix E of Fed Compliance Report
Sample Syllabi Reviewed by the site visit team: (Documents on file with the team)
   Face-to-face, fall semester classes
       AR 112-01 Perspectives on Art
       BI 151-01H (face-to-face) and BI 151-740 (online) Biological Reasoning
       NC 371 Fundamentals of Nursing
       QM 358 Production/Operations Management

   Online classes
       MA 134 College Algebra
       PS 103 Political Systems

   Eight week compressed classes
       BS 118 Introduction to Process Science for Elementary Teachers
       EL 351 Teaching Science in Elementary School

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Program Components

1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition: 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). New for 2012: The Commission has a new policy on the Credit Hour. Complete the Worksheet in Appendix A and then complete the following responses. Attach the Worksheet to this form.

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.
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_____ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends 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 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: None needed

2. 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 for the three years prior to the visit.

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 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 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:

Complaint resolution policies and procedures are in place with appropriate appeals procedures clearly communicated. The number of complaints seems very light to light with no apparent red flag category – it appears many of the complaints were dealt with at the informal departmental level where they are referred to first. For all the Complaint Logs examined, nothing appeared out of the ordinary, either in number of complaints or their significance or topic.

Additional Monitoring, if any: None needed.
3. Transfer Policies: 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.

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 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 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: SMSU acknowledges there are difficulties with transfer of credits from the state two-year colleges and in effectively communicating the transfer processes. The University is actively engaged in updating transfer policies and guides in order to improve communication and capture actionable feedback.

Additional Monitoring, if any: None needed

4. 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 has appropriate protocols to disclose additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.

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 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 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: SMSU uses Student ID’s and passwords, in addition to standard cyber security measures. Regional campuses provide proctored, on-site examinations for online classes if the professor requests it.

Additional Monitoring, if any: None needed

5. Title IV Program and Related Responsibilities: The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.

- **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.
  The Team notes that the institution auditors commented in their materials about the strength of the institutions finances in spite of severe cuts in funding from the state.

- **Default Rates:** The institution has provided the Commission with information about three years of default rates. 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.
  The default rates at Southeast Missouri State University are low and the institution employs an aggressive program of communication and tracking of students at risk.

- **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.
- **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.

- **Contractual Relationships:** The institution has no contractual relationships of this nature.

- **Consortial Relationships:** The institution has no consortial relationships of this nature.

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 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 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: None needed

6. **Institutional Disclosures and Advertising and Recruitment Materials:** 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.

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 follow-up.
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_____ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends 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: None needed

7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with State Regulatory Boards: 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. Note that if the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is currently under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor in the past five years, the team must explain the action 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.

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 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 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: The institution provided a list of all accreditations and their status which was current in all cases.

Additional Monitoring, if any: None needed.
8. Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party 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.**

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 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 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: Third party comments were written and verbal and were overwhelmingly positive. The passionate negative comments, again both written and verbal, were done in a very respectful manner and addressed by other students in person and by assurances that the complaints would be aired through the channels available to the students.

Additional Monitoring, if any: None needed.
Appendix B
Credits and Program Length

Instructions: The team reviews the “Protocol for Peer Reviewers Reviewing Credit Hours Under the Commission’s New Policies” before completing this Worksheet. This Worksheet must be completed for all Quality Checkup visits after January 1, 2012.

A: Answer the Following Questions

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.)

☐ 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?

☐ 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?

☐ 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.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

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.)

[ ] 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?

[ ] 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?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
Comments: Even the compressed courses at SMSU were only compressed in delivery time, not in time on task, required assignments/activities, or in expected student learning outcomes.

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?

[ ] 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?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
Comments:

B: Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team. 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.
Sample Syllabi Reviewed by the site visit team: (Documents on file with the team)

**Face-to-face, fall semester classes**
- AR 112-01 Perspectives on Art
- BI 151-01H Biological Reasoning
- NC 371 Fundamentals of Nursing
- QM 358 Production/Operations Management

**Online classes**
- BI 151-740 Biological Reasoning
- MA 134 College Algebra
- PS 103 Political Systems

**Eight week compressed classes**
- BS 118 Introduction to Process Science for Elementary Teachers
- EL 351 Teaching Science in Elementary School

**C: Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate**

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

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

Rationale:

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

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

None found.