



2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle
Appendix H: Academic Audit
Undergraduate Programs

Institution: TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE TN		
Program Title: B.A IN HISTORY		
CIP Code:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Academic Audit Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> First Academic Audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Second Academic Audit

Instructions for Academic Audit Team:

In accordance with the 2010-15 Performance Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable undergraduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle. If the program under review contains embedded Technical Certificates, the names of each certificate should be included on the "Program Title" line above. The review of embedded certificates must be included as part of the review of the program in which they are embedded. Embedded certificates do not require a separate Summary Sheet.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "*Academic Audit Summary Sheet*." The Summary Sheet lists 26 criteria grouped into eight categories. THEC will use the criteria in categories 1-6 to assess Performance Funding Standard 1C when the Academic Audit process is used for programs undergoing the Academic Audit process for the first time. For programs undergoing the Academic Audit for the second time, criteria 7 (follow-up) will also be used to assess Standard 1C. The criteria in the eighth category, Support, may be used by the institution and submitted as part of the Performance Funding report. If the Academic Audit process did not include information about criteria 8.1 - 8.3, they should be marked N/A. These criteria will not be included in the THEC Performance Funding point calculation.

These criteria have been selected based on the Academic Audit Focal Areas to be consistent with the spirit and process of the Academic Audit. The program faculty has provided a self-study document that includes information for each criterion within the Focal Areas. Supporting documents will be available as specified in the self study. As the Academic Audit Team Leader, you should assess this and other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether the process has met each criterion within a category. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each criterion in the table.

The Academic Audit Summary Sheet will be sent to the appropriate campus official for inclusion in the Annual Performance Funding Report. When combined with the self study and the written report prepared by the visiting team, the Summary Sheet will facilitate institutional development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria will be used in allocating state funds for the community college or university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Academic Audit Team Leader (s):

Name Name

DR GHINYERE OGBONNA -McGRUDER

Title Title

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR / PROGRAM MANAGER PM/CJ MAIN CAMPUS AP:

Institution Institution

Chunyere Oboh-Morley

Date Signature

23rd March 2012

Date

Academic Audit Summary Sheet

Institution: TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE TN		
Program Title: BA IN HISTORY		
CIP Code:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Academic Audit Status	___ First Academic Audit	___ Second Academic Audit

1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES		Met	Not Met
1.1	The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for developing learning objectives for the program, considering measurability, clarity and what students need to know.	✓	
1.2	The faculty documented or proposed a process for developing learning objectives that are based on realistic and appropriate evidence.	✓	
1.3	The faculty documented or proposed specific plans to take best practices and appropriate benchmarks into account in the analysis of learning objectives.	✓	

2. CURRICULUM AND CO-CURRICULUM		Met	Not Met
2.1	The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of the extent to which they collaborate effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.	✓	
2.2	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for analyzing the content and sequencing of courses in terms of achieving program learning objectives.	✓	
2.3	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for the ongoing review of curriculum and co-curriculum based on appropriate evidence including comparison with best practices where appropriate.	✓	
3. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES		Met	Not Met
3.1	The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for guiding and improving teaching and learning throughout the program.	✓	
3.2	The faculty documented or proposed a plan that promotes the effective use of instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.	✓	
3.3	The faculty analyzed the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in the design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program.	✓	
4. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT		Met	Not Met
4.1	The faculty documented or proposed indicators of student learning success that are keyed to the learning objectives of the program.	✓	
4.2	The faculty documented or proposed assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices and appropriate comparisons.	✓	
4.3	The faculty documented or proposed a plan for using student learning assessments that leads to continuous improvements in the program.	✓	
4.4	The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.	✓	

5. QUALITY ASSURANCE		Met	Not Met
5.1	There is an evident commitment to making continuous quality improvements in the program a top priority.	✓	
5.2	The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.	✓	
6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT		Met	Not Met
6.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.	✓	
6.2	The Academic Audit process (self-study and visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes including all five focal areas.	✓	
6.3	The process resulted in a candid description of weaknesses in program processes and suggestions for improvements.	✓	
6.4	Overall, the visiting team affirms the openness and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.	✓	
6.5	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from stakeholder groups identified by the program's faculty.	✓	
7. FOLLOW-UP OF PREVIOUS AUDIT *		Met	Not Met
7.1	An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.	✓	
7.2	There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Audit Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.	✓	
7.3	There is documented evidence that the program has implemented and tracked the progress of and use of results from improvement initiatives cited by the faculty its self study.	✓	
8. SUPPORT <i>(Note: The Support category is NOT included in the Performance Funding calculation. If the Academic Audit process did not address these criteria, they should be marked "NA.")</i>		Met	Not Met
8.1	The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.		
8.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.		
8.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.		

* Criterion only included in the performance funding calculation for programs undergoing the Academic Audit during the 2010-2015 cycle that also used the Academic Audit in the 2005-10 cycle. Note: please be sure that the "Second Academic Audit" is checked on page 1.

Revised March 17, 2011

TSU History Academic Audit

March 23, 2012

Commendations:

- 1) The department is to be commended for the connection and impact that the faculty members make with their students. The students speak very highly about the quality of the faculty within the history department.
- 2) The department is to be commended for embracing the WRITE program. Even though the initiative is very young, a great deal of effort and commitment has gone into developing critical thinking skills not only in the survey class but also extending these efforts to the majors in the upper level courses.
- 3) The department is to be commended for the collaborative manner in which they work. This is evidenced in the development of a well written and thorough self study as well as in the way in which they have worked to involve their adjunct faculty
- 4) The department is to be commended for its work on the American History Survey course. The collaborative work of the committee has led to a set of standard student learning outcomes, a textbook that is specific to and suitable for their student population, and a common study guide and test bank. The department should be aware that the students appreciate these efforts and are especially positive about the common study guide.

Affirmations:

- 1) The audit team affirms the work that the department has done on the History Workshop, the Major Field Test, and the Senior Project. In particular we want to encourage the department to continue its integration of the WRITE program in the upper level courses, especially in developing the research skills in the History Workshop that will allow students to prepare an exemplary Senior Project.
- 2) The audit team wishes to affirm the work the American History Survey Committee has done on developing and applying a rubric to the student writing projects. We encourage the department to improve the training on applying the rubric to work toward more uniformity.
- 3) The audit team wants to affirm the manner in which the department has managed to integrate the adjunct faculty in to their discussions and decision making. We encourage you to continue this practice and move toward even greater involvement.
- 4) The audit team wants to affirm the work the department has done to identify best practices within the discipline as well as within individual courses. We would encourage you to continue this practice and perhaps develop a forum or regular meeting in which department members can share with others practices that have worked well for them as well as seek help in improving on individual initiatives.
- 5) The audit team wants to affirm the department's efforts to develop an internship program for their majors. We strongly encourage you to strive to reach the goal of full implementation of this program by fall 2013.

Recommendations:

- 1) The audit team recommends that the department aggressively pursue initiatives to upgrade the technology in their classrooms. The committee strongly encourages the department to convert all its classrooms to smart classrooms and perhaps develop one classroom that is state of the art in smart classroom technology.
- 2) The audit team recommends that the department work on the foreign language requirement. Students perceive this requirement as a burden. Options include working on providing methods to provide or accept a wider range of languages, educating students on why the foreign language requirement is useful, and/or incorporating the use of a foreign language in upper division courses, especially in course activities and assignments. In addition, the department should collaborate with the foreign language department to avoid conflicts between the language classes and especially upper level major classes.
- 3) The audit team recommends the department explore moving the HIST 1110/112 courses into the History Department.
- 4) The audit team recommends that the department initiate a periodic roundtable discussion with the students. The students provide a valuable perspective on the operation of the department and the group format leads to a synergistic evaluation and elucidation of perceptions and problems that the department will find to be a valuable resource.