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I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

Comprehensive site visit

B. Institutional Context

Arizona State University (ASU) is the largest public university under one administration in the United States, with 73,000 students (drawn from across Arizona, the United States, and 110 other countries), and 2600 faculty. It is one of the nation’s leading research universities. Since 1994 it has held Carnegie “RU/VH” designation – research university/very high research activity. It is one of 3 public universities in Arizona with oversight provided by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABR). ASU’s history and current status have been strongly and continuously influenced by the growth of Arizona, today one of the most rapidly growing and diverse states, and of the Phoenix metropolitan area, now the fifth largest in the country.

It began in 1885 as the Territory Normal School, and the emphasis on teacher preparation continued as it was renamed Tempe State Teachers’ College (1925), and then Arizona State Teachers’ College at Tempe (1929). As its programmatic emphases expanded to respond to the growth of the state, with offerings related to science and agriculture, it was renamed Arizona State College at Tempe in 1945. The people of Arizona voted, on a state ballot, a proposition to rename it Arizona State University (ASU) in 1958, and thus it is a relatively young state university in a national context. Since then, it has grown dramatically in enrollment with expanded degree offerings, and has enhanced its research mission.

Accredited by the North Central Association since 1931, the University, as it prepared for its 2003 NCA/HLC self-study and comprehensive review, saw the appointment of a new President (2002), Michael M. Crow, and the institution has undergone remarkable change over the past decade through the leadership team that he has established. Documents related to a new mission, core values, and design aspirations were developed with widespread input, and were distributed widely.

The vision was to create, and be a model for, the “New American University”, one that would strive for excellence, access, and impact in all that it does. It is to be measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes. It pursues research and discovery that benefits the public good. It assumes major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community. With that vision, its mission and goals are to: demonstrate American leadership in academic excellence and accessibility; establish national standing in academic quality and impact of colleges and schools in every field; establish ASU as a global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery, and development by 2020; and enhance its local impact and embeddedness. Subsequent actions have been aligned with “8 design aspirations”.

Through two major planning initiatives – the Comprehensive Development Plan and “One University Many Places” - there have been substantial changes in the physical, organizational, and human landscapes of the University, with many new buildings, the appointment of hundreds of new faculty, and the truly dramatic reorganization of programs, schools, and institutes, with a strong effort at trans-disciplinary collaborations.
The University has developed metrics and identified peer institutions to monitor and benchmark changes. Over the past decade: there has been substantial improvement in student retention and graduation; strong growth in research-related expenditures, and in endowments; substantial investment by local governments in campuses and centers; and growth in domestic and international partnerships.

However, during that same time period there have been two major challenges:

i) the need to respond to rapid growth of a diverse population – from the 2000-2010 (US Census) period, growth rates of ~25% for the state, including a 37% growth in the minority population; ~25% growth for Maricopa County, where the University is located; and ~30% growth for the Phoenix Metropolitan Area - and thus the need to help provide access to postsecondary education for this population; and

ii) the economic downturn of 2008 that has resulted in a decline in state appropriations. From 2008-2010 the University system absorbed cuts of nearly 30%, and today (FY13) state appropriations in the All Funds Budget are 15% of the total budget, compared to 37% at the time of the last site visit. The University has responded in three primary ways: permanent increases in other sources of revenue (notably tuition); targeted cost reductions focused on administrative and academic efficiency (primarily staff positions); and the use of temporary sources of support (including furloughs). As the economic downturn eased during 2012, the legislature began allocating new funds to the state universities and adopted a new performance-based budgeting approach.

As an outgrowth of the reorganization, in 2006, HLC approved its request to have all 4 campuses that had developed over the past 3 decades be accredited through one institution. Included was one campus that had been separately accredited, and one that emerged in 2006, when the people of the City of Phoenix voted to tax themselves to develop and support it. Thus within the context of One University Many Places, this comprehensive visit included: ASU at Tempe campus, ASU at West campus, ASU at Polytechnic campus, and ASU at Downtown Phoenix campus. All campuses are now administered, centrally through one location – the Tempe campus - and they function as One University.

Clearly, all of this change is linked to, and should be addressed within, the 5 criteria for accreditation. The Team needed to ensure that it could understand as fully as possible the current institutional context. Accordingly, the Site Review Team: met with University leaders at the beginning of the site visit for overview sessions on the current status and future directions for academic programs, research, and finances at the institution; asked for special sessions with deans and department/school chairs/directors to discuss the impact of the many changes that had occurred, on local activities; interacted with governance leaders (faculty, staff, students), with some Team members attending a Faculty Senate meeting; and members of the Team visited each of the 4 campuses.

B. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit

None

C. Additional Locations or Branch Campuses Visited (if applicable)

None
D. Distance Delivery Reviewed

Since 2008, distance education has been administered through “ASU on-line” and led by a Dean/Executive Vice Provost who had a personal history of this type of educational activity through his affiliation with the University’s College of Business. He is a part of the University’s leadership team and reports to the Executive Vice President and University Provost. That hierarchical arrangement shows the importance of distance education to the University’s mission and planning. The office includes approximately 25 people covering areas such as: administration; marketing and communications; corporate partnerships; website design and development; student services; and instructional design and new media. Team members met with the leadership team for ASU on-line, and reviewed related documents including syllabi for on-line courses/programs. See: [http://asuonline.asu.edu](http://asuonline.asu.edu).

Currently, 64 programs (32 undergraduate and 32 graduate) are offered on-line. Approval of courses/programs follows established institutional, faculty-led processes and is aligned with the established, expected student learning outcomes. Since 2008, ASU has adopted Quality Matters (QM), a faculty-centered, peer-reviewed process and rubric designed to certify the quality of on-line courses. The review is designed to ensure that: course expectations are clearly communicated, student learning is assessed based on those expectations; and that on-line courses include meaningful interaction between instructors and students.

The technology infrastructure and support for on-line learning are largely provided by outside vendors, Pearson and Academic Partnerships. All technical on line programs are provided by partners: only support for faculty development and course development are done through the University’s online programs organization.

The “ASU on-line” website provides students with clear information on: credit hour costs, time expectations for course completion, transfer processes, access to University resources, and the full array of student services (including those for military veterans). There is an on-line student orientation, a help center, and a list of frequently-asked questions.

Ambitious plans exist for growth of on-line enrollment from 3,000 to 35,000 students by 2020. The University was informed during the site visit that it very soon will need to apply to HLC for approval of movement to the next percentage category of distance offerings.

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process

The University began the process in August 2009 with the appointment of a Self-Study Coordinator. Also appointed were a 6-member Steering Committee and Criterion Teams with two faculty members serving as Co-Leaders of each Team. During Spring 2011 the Self Study Plan was presented to and approved by the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Over the next year, a draft self-study report was produced, and in August 2012 was made available for review and comment by the University community.
Focus groups were held. Beginning in October 2012 the Self-Study Coordinator interacted periodically with the Chair of the Site Review Team for brief updates on progress on the process being followed.

On February 13, 2013, the Chair of the Site Review Team visited the University, was hosted by the Self-Study Coordinator, and met with senior administrators, faculty leaders, and others who had been involved with the self-study process. Following that visit the Chair interacted on a weekly basis with the Self-Study Coordinator to develop the daily schedule for the Site Visit and ensure that there was access to the Resource Room and that supplemental materials were made available.

It is clear to the Team that the process was thorough and inclusive, and seen by many members of the University community as an important effort at providing an overview of the activities of the past decade but most importantly a point of departure for next steps.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

The University produced a thorough, well-organized self-study. It also provided a complete, virtual Resource Room for the Team, made accessible in an acceptable time frame for the Team members’ review prior to the site visit. Initial difficulties in accessing some materials in the Resource Room were resolved quickly. When a considerable amount of additional information was requested by the Team during the visit, it was provided promptly and thoroughly.

The Team met with a very large number of individuals during the visit, including extra sessions that were added as needed. It was clear that all with whom the Team met were fully engaged in the process prior to and during the visit. Discussions were open and participants spoke freely about their experiences and views.

Institutions undergoing an HLC comprehensive visit in 2013 have no model/examples to follow for the review process that took effect this calendar year. The University showed strong effort in defining, as best it could, the relevant patterns of evidence and supporting materials for each criterion and core component.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

The 2003 Site Review Team identified no areas that required Commission follow-up, but did identify 5 areas that needed institutional attention: handling student complaints; clarifying the institution’s mission and vision; limited resources and faculty and staff compensation; financial aid availability; and resources for growing student enrollment. Through a review of the response to each in the current Self-Study, and discussions with members of the campus community, the Team considers the response of the institution to previously identified challenges to be adequate.

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

The call for Third Party Comment went out in December 2012. Nine responses were received. Eight – including former students, donors, and community contacts - were very complimentary of the University, the impact that it has, and has had, on individuals and the broader communities it serves. Specific reference was made to the dynamic nature of the institution today.
One response raised concerns about advising for transfer students, and the University, given how important transfer students are to the enrollment profile of the institution, is following up in detail.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

Met. See accompanying forms and worksheets.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

• The institution’s mission is clear and has been consistently and persistently articulated, and its implementation serves as a source of pride among faculty and staff. There is broad understanding across the University about the nature of its mission and goals and that they drive decision making. Deans reported that most promotion and tenure policies reflect the mission statement, and that budget decisions are consistent. For example, increased enrollment is an imperative and unit leaders are held accountable for implementation and success.

• The unique mission of ASU was articulated by the President during his hiring process. All those with whom the Team met indicated that the mission has been consistently followed since his arrival in all aspects of University operations. Representatives of the Board of Regents indicated the Board is in full support of ASU’s mission and goals.

• Reflecting the University’s mission to be inclusive and to increase access, ASU moved from a low tuition, low access institution to a moderate tuition, high access University by investing heavily in financial aid and programs to serve minority and lower socio-economic populations. Pell grant students tripled from 2003 to 2012 and in proportion to a racial composition that roughly reflects the population of Arizona.

• The institution consists of four vibrant campuses. While each has a distinctive theme,
the University achieves its mission of One University Many Places, administratively, academically, and financially. The structure of the programs on the four campuses that comprise ASU were planned and (re-)organized in accordance with the University’s mission and goals. Geographic dispersal allows easier access to its campuses by students with diverse backgrounds.

Each campus is home to one or more academic colleges, with the disciplinary mix providing the thematic unity to the campus. Many programs are placed so that faculty and students can engage with private sector counterparts or potential clientele. The institution selected disciplines for the Downtown campus to leverage geographic proximity to state government, state-wide media, and state medical and health resources. Faculty, students and staff at the Downtown campus spoke of the synergies of being co-located with other related programs. The Polytechnic campus programs are built to engage the industrial private sector in its region of the metropolitan area.

The University deploys centrally-provided services on each campus, ranging from disability services, to library services, to tutoring, all deeply integrated with resources on the other campuses. Although each campus is the home to one (or more) colleges, each college dean reports to a single academic officer, the Executive Vice President and University Provost, on the Tempe campus. Some deans are responsible for programming on more than one campus, but a single dean manages college resources, including faculty, regardless of where they are deployed. In an open discussion with all deans, there was strong support for this approach and indeed many had accepted their positions based on their support of this model.

- Emphasizing a focus on interdisciplinarity and engagement of the research enterprise for the public good, ASU has significantly increased its research expenditures over the last decade from $100 million to $400 million, in part by forming interdisciplinary research institutes such as the Bio-design Institute to focus on biomedicine, the Global Institute of Sustainability, and the Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict, many of which address important contemporary issues of public concern.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:
• Arizona State University’s Mission and Goals statements, Core Values and Design Aspirations are published in widely-distributed printed materials, and on its extensive website, and are displayed in campus facilities and in community venues, such as billboards. Some of the social media the institution has used to connect with internal and external stakeholders include Facebook, Twitter, ASU on iTunes, Foursquare, and ASU Alert. According to the self-study report, ASU’s current five-year strategic plan (FY 2013-2017) was finalized in January 2012 after extensive consultation and input from all stakeholders. The goals statement contained in the strategic plan highlights the ASU mission and is explicit in how achievements will be measured. The collaborative and interactive process by which the University developed its goals statement reflects a commitment to transparency among all stakeholders. Interviews with faculty, staff, students, and Regents (ABOR) indicate that a majority of internal and external stakeholders have knowledge of the mission and goals statements of the University.

• The organization’s mission and goals documents are clear and publicly articulate the organization’s commitments. ASU Mission Statement, Core Values and Design Aspirations, referred to as “foundational documents” throughout the self-study report, are consistent with the long-term strategic plan (2020 Vision) adopted by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) in 2008. In addition to the 2020 Vision report, in 2010 the ABOR outlined a set of measures of productivity in a document entitled “The Arizona Higher Education Enterprise”. Review of institutional documents and interviews with faculty and staff confirmed that ASU goals statement and performance metrics are aligned with those outlined in the 2020 Vision report and in “The Arizona Higher Education Enterprise” document. As one of the three public universities in the State of Arizona, ASU has been very responsive to the mandates of ABOR for the Arizona University System, an entity responsible for establishing mission and strategic directions for three distinct public universities in the state.

• ASU is guided by a clearly articulated set of practices and principles that inform and shape its operations. The mission of ASU is “to establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community”. This mission statement defines the nature, scope and purpose of the education provided by the institution and the students to be served. Reviews of the institutional accomplishments over the last 10 years and interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff confirm that this mission statement informs plans and strategic decisions of the institution. The ABOR approved the University’s request to establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured by inclusion, by research and discovery that benefit the public good, and by assuming responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and well-being of the community.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

- Since its last site visit, the University created a Diversity Council and wrote a diversity action plan: “Building Blocks for Success through People, Programming and Policies”. The plan offers a public statement on campus diversity and diversity goals at ASU, which is available online as “ASU’s Diversity Plan” (http://diversity.asu.edu/sites/default/files/Diversity_Plan.pdf). This action plan resulted in the creation of the Office of Equity and Inclusion, addressing diversity issues across the University and all of its members. Leadership continues to make strong public statements about the University’s commitment to diversity.

- The University is making positive strides toward a diverse student body that better reflects the state as a whole. The student population on campus reflects the state’s demographics, including regionally significant groups of Native American and Hispanic populations. Future growth in some groups, especially Hispanics should be anticipated, based on the gap between the student body and recent population trends in Arizona. Intellectual and cultural diversity is also promoted by a growing out-of-state and international student population, which is fully supported by the governing board (ABOR).

- A focus on retention has resulted in first-year persistence rates of most groups that are similar to majority whites (~80%). Graduation rates show a growing number of Hispanics receiving degrees, both undergraduate and graduate, and the anticipation of future growth. Recent trends indicate that completion rates may remain a challenge, however. For example the current 6-year graduation rate for Hispanics remains stubbornly low at slightly over 50% and persistence rates have even seen some decline based on the latest institutional snapshot data.

- The University focuses on diversity among its faculty ranks, but budget pressures, especially in staff positions, limited the ability to make significant improvements through new hiring practices. Nevertheless, Hispanic representation in staff ranks grew by 20% over the past decade. The need for greater representation of minority groups in the faculty ranks is recognized by the leadership, but remains relatively low. The student body is roughly equal with regard to gender, while the female/male ratio continues to grow slowly in faculty ranks through targeted hiring practices. The disciplinary imbalances in gender ratios of faculty are similar to those at other major research institutions.

- Recognizing the role of diversity in education, the University offers a large suite of academic and co-curricular programs that focus on aspects of diversity. Currently, more than 380 undergraduate and graduate degree programs are available, such as an undergraduate certificate in LGBT studies. A large number of student activities focus on diversity, especially in the region, many of which are supported by the University. For example, the President’s special advisor on American Indian Affairs supports and coordinates outreach to 20+ local tribes, reflecting the University’s unique location.
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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

- ASU has a multitude of ongoing and well-coordinated educational, multicultural events and partnerships that demonstrate its commitment to the public good and enriching the community. Several colleges (i.e., the W.P Carey School of Business, School of Music, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College and the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law), non-academic units (i.e., Art Museum, ASU Washington Center), and research centers (i.e., The Center for Indian Education, Hispanic Research Center, Center for Urban Innovation) sponsor programs and activities aimed at enhancing the economic, social and cultural vitality, health and well-being of the community. Faculty and student involvement in service learning and civic engagement is well-documented in the self-study report and through campus interviews. Campus recreational facilities and other facilities are open to students, staff, and members of the local community. ASU commitment both rhetorically and programmatically, to civic engagement is evident by the many opportunities and incentives created by the University.

- ASU’s actions and decisions reflect a commitment to serve the public through partnerships and agreements with community colleges. By creating administrative structures, such as the Academic Program Articulation Steering Committee, ASU will contribute to the efforts of the State of Arizona to enhance seamless transfer of community college students to upper-level programs and increase the number of Arizona students who successfully complete a baccalaureate degree.

- The Teachers College offers more than 30 programs across the state and includes a program, called Senior Year Residency that actively places students in the school district as student teachers for a full year. The program includes attention to the diversity aspects that are characteristic of this region by including reservations in its target schools. Other similarly successful examples include Skysong, a facility incubator of start-up companies, and Law School clinics to provide legal services to underserved communities.

- The University places emphasis on service learning activities and identifies hundreds of student organizations that serve local communities. For example, a program supporting teenagers-at-risk is offered in the greater Phoenix area. Other examples include industry partnerships such as iProjects at the Polytechnic campus that is part
of the formal curriculum of engineering students. Progress by faculty and staff for activities in this area is recognized by University leadership and is illustrated by regularly awarding the President's medal in Community Access Research Experiences (CARE). Efforts in this area are also recognized at the national level through inclusion in the Higher Education Service Honor Roll over an ongoing period of several years.

Team Determination on Criterion One:

Criterion is met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

Over the past decade, the University has developed new documents for mission and goals, core values, and design aspirations that are clear, consistently and persistently articulated publicly, well known by the entire University community, aligned with state priorities and directions, and supported by the Arizona Board of Regents. The University understands and responds to the diverse society within which it functions, with an Office of Equity and Inclusion, a Diversity Council, programs/offerings on diversity, and concerted efforts at having a diverse faculty, staff, and student body, that includes out-of-state and international students. And the University has a multitude of ongoing and well-coordinated educational, multicultural events and partnerships with the community, has strong working relationships with state community colleges, and has hundreds of student organizations that serve local communities. The Team concludes that there is ample evidence to show that the institution’s mission is clear, articulated publicly, and guides the institution’s operations.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

• Since the announcement of 2020 Vision, Arizona State University has demonstrated significant strides in managing its financial condition through short- and long-term financial planning. Monthly financial statements monitor financial conditions, financial relationships with affiliates were restructured, and a long-range financial plan proposes restructuring ASU’s indebtedness. This plan’s resource base shows current and future capacity for sustaining educational programs and supporting and strengthening their quality in the future.
• As a large public institution, ASU has grouped its vast array of policies into manuals of related policies. All manuals are available on-line, and the policies themselves are continuously updated in accordance with changes in germane laws and best practices. Faculty members know about the policies or know who to ask to find them. The staff seems very comfortable knowing where and how to find policies. A hotline provides members of the University community and the public an anonymous means by which to report suspected breaches of policy and/or safety. ASU policies cover and guide the full range of institutional financial, academic, staff, and auxiliary functions and contribute to the recognition ASU has received for sound management and compliance on these important fronts.

• The Code of Ethics makes explicit ASU’s expectations of faculty vis-à-vis students with whom they teach, advise, and work; research conduct; and civility. Anti-nepotism policies and whistleblower protections are in place. Established search and hiring procedures seek to honor all rules regarding selecting and welcoming new members into the institution. Annual performance reviews (including post-tenure) and grievance procedures serve them once they are on board. A standing committee of the University Senate investigates allegations of breaches of academic freedom, safeguarding an institutional value highlighted frequently by the President. Via these and other diverse means, ASU communicates its professional and ethical expectations and helps its members live up to them.

The Purchasing and Business Services Manual has been maintained in a manner that addresses many current issues in today’s business environment. Financial and purchasing personnel are qualified and participate in national professional standard-setting organizations such as National Association of College and University Business Leaders (NACUBO). The financial system is subject to state audit. The University is to be commended for having in place since 1984 policies concerning small, women-owned and disadvantaged businesses. Revisiting this policy to more specifically define “disadvantaged” to address priorities for underrepresented minority and veteran businesses may be warranted.

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

Evidence:

• Information on ASU’s programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs, and control is unambiguously presented on its website. In addition, the website provides rich details and abundant ancillary information—text, video, photographs, data, etc.—to give texture and context to what the University offers. ASU also makes clear how to contact the institution for further information.

• HLC accreditation is marked, as stated, on the ASU “academic programs” website. A listing of all specialized accreditation information for academic programs is available on the website of the Executive Vice President and University Provost’s Office. It is somewhat more difficult to find, for example, business at the very bottom of the
The (http://wpcarey.asu.edu/WPCarey.cfm) site, while the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College accreditation information is much less obvious.

- ASU’s admissions processes and requirements for prospective students are clearly laid out in an accessible and easy to use website (http://www.asu.edu/prospective). The financial assistance link provides an interactive tool to assist prospective students to estimate costs (http://www.students.asu.edu/financialaid/costs). Major degree requirements are accessible at (http://webapp4.asu.edu/programs/t5/undergrad?init=false&nopassive=true). Each major link contains an “apply” button. Program availability by campus is clearly presented on the website.

- Public information about the faculty is provided by each academic unit. For some units, this information is one click away and for others it is multiple clicks. For example, to find the faculty in the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, one has to first find the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, then the school, then click on people, and click on each area within the school. In contrast, in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, the easy-to-find “about faculty” link takes viewers directly to a directory of faculty organized in alphabetical order.

- A dedicated website guides transfer students through the process of entering the University. This site is well designed and addresses all of the issues typically brought into question by students who intend to transfer to a new institution. This effort by ASU should provide an advantage in attracting students interested in transferring.

- The Regent’s policy 4-101 requires that a master list of tuition and fee changes be maintained by ASU. This list, available online at http://students.asu.edu/tuitionandfees, and provides a detailed calculator and itemizes the sources of fees. This provision meets the spirit and the intent of ABOR’s policy and serves the needs of the students well.

**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:** Core Component is met
Evidence:

- ABOR established the 2020 Vision plan with a quartet of goals related to education, research, workforce and community, and productivity. These goals align with ASU’s mission statement and with aspirations worthy of an institution that announces itself as creating a new model for the American university.

- The Board of Regents includes several ex officio members. The chair of the Arizona Faculties Council is among those included. Arizona, by statute, has one Board of Regents that governs all three of its state universities. This system is designed to provide synergies among the universities thus providing access to an improved quality of education for the state’s residents. Faculty members close to the Board indicate that now the Board advocates for ASU better than in the recent past. Conversation with the Board also revealed a rather detailed understanding of ASU priorities and needs.

- Tuition hearings are public and are broadcast, allowing the public and members of ASU to share their opinions. Student members of ABOR have been instrumental to tuition increase discussions and decisions. The faculty chair attends ABOR meetings and may speak but not vote. To keep in further touch with campus needs, the Regents’ president recently spoke to the ASU Faculty Senate. Faculty members who were previously not included in ABOR retreats now attend.

- ABOR expects the public universities to stimulate economic development in the state. Based on its location and spectrum of programs, ASU plays a major role in achieving that goal.

- The state of Arizona crisply spells out ABOR’s responsibilities regarding conflict of interest and governance duties broadly, liberating Regents from undue donor or political pressures. Liability insurance protects ABOR members, facilitating sound decision-making.

- ABOR policy makes the president and his/her designees responsible for the daily oversight of the institution. State law stipulates that faculty must share in academic and educational governance matters. The curriculum and course development processes illustrate the interplay of individual and departmental faculty with the chair, dean, and the Executive Vice President and University Provost in this regard.

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

Team Determination: Core Component is met

Evidence:

- At ASU, academic freedom (Policy ABOR 5-503) extends not just to faculty, academic personnel, and students but also to staff when any is “engaged in teaching and/or research.” A policy makes this apparent to all. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) exists to ensure that means of redress are available when violations have occurred. By virtue of both policy and structure, ASU is
prepared to back those appropriately protected by academic freedom.

- CAFT investigates charges of interference with academic freedom or the faculty tenure process, and few cases have had to be reported to the Senate or President. The recent substantial academic consolidations occasioned by the acute economic downturn have created the need to redraft bylaws for the newly-created academic units; because these Bylaws lay out tenure standards and processes, having them promptly in hand will help avoid procedural problems with promotion and tenure.

- While ASU champions the tenets of academic freedom, its Policy Statement Supporting Diversity and Free Speech (ACD 102) also carefully articulates that respect for academic freedom requires tolerance for different, even what some might consider expressions of abhorrent opinion.

- The University has established Committees for Campus Inclusion on each campus of ASU. This system of committees specific to each location seems well designed due to the differences, both historical and currently cultivated, with communication between/among these committees maintained to assure the integrity of the institution-wide inclusion policy. Students and faculty interests are well protected by the system in place and reaction to it by such groups is positive.

- Team convened a meeting with the leadership of all offices related to compliance – including legal affairs – and confirmed that such offices work in an integrated manner, to ensure that the institution acts with integrity, and with ethical and responsible conduct.

**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:** Core Component is met

**Evidence:**

- The Office for Knowledge Enterprise Development (OKED) bears responsibility for the processes entrusted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC). These committees review and monitor research protocols to ensure compliance with ethical and safety standards related to human subjects, research animal use, and biosafety. IRB support staff conducts audits, including random audits, to check that approved protocols are being observed. All those who care for and/or use animals in research or teaching (academics, staff, and students) are required to complete online training and certification on responsible animal care and use. IACUC monitoring continues post-approval in the form of biannual lab inspections, frequent observation by ASU veterinarians and animal care staff, and
regular inspections by Federal agencies and specialized accreditors. Through these interlocking mechanisms, researchers learn what is required for ethical research and how to meet those requirements.

- For an institution without a medical school, animal care and use on the ASU campus is quite complex, involving facilities at the Tempe and West campuses for a variety of species. Because Animal Care is a recharge service unit, its staff and facility size depend on faculty recruitment and retention and the funding secured by those faculty members. Balancing research-readiness while keeping costs low, poses a challenge for the unit. Bridge funding for these facilities would improve their readiness and reduce start-up costs.

- The institution appears to place extraordinary emphasis on ethics and integrity. When asked what prompted this intense focus, a faculty member cited the huge increase in Federal grants, the plans for further growth, and the deep determination to avoid any misstep that might derail this trajectory.

- Journalism, business, and engineering have varying forms of honor system requirements. In the School of Journalism all students have to sign an academic honesty pledge for every class. Academic integrity is noted on every syllabus. One student recommended that in addition to reiterating the prohibition against cheating, syllabi should also advise students what to do when they witness cheating.

- Engineering is considering an honor code to develop a culture of integrity as soon as students enter, long before they assume, as an alumnus/a, the mantle of professional status. One of the specific strategies being considered is an initiation ceremony to induct students into the Order of the Engineer to complement the Oath of the Engineer ceremony that accompanies graduation. Students thus inducted receive a ring to wear symbolizing high ethical standards.

- Very strict policies and processes guide the handling of academic misconduct by doctoral students. Academic misconduct led ASU to revoke three Ph.D. degrees in the last five years. Some units require students to use iThenticate™ or some other method for discovering potential plagiarism themselves.

- Similarly, the institution deals firmly with academic misconduct. All employees are required to report suspected misconduct. The Misconduct in Research Subcommittee convened three times in 2011 and 2012, with two findings.

- As part of overseeing the National Science Foundation (NSF) mandate to train students and postdoctoral researchers to conduct research responsibly, the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance (ORIA) provides online training, ethics seminars, and workshops featuring distinguished principal investigators. ASU’s professional development seminars for graduate students range from how to deal with difficult human subjects (such as children or prostitutes) to the ethics of authorship. These offerings are available to undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers independent of their source of funding. These sessions are memorialized on podcasts so that all may access them 24/7. Faculty members reported referring their students to these abundant resources. In addition, ASU now subscribes to the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative and relies on it for IRB
and Human Subjects and Responsible Conduct of Research training.

- In its Student Code of Conduct, ASU prohibits academic dishonesty. The Student Academic Integrity policy lays out the disciplinary process and sanctions for such breaches. Additional policies delineate expectations for proper use of electronic resources, university property, intellectual property, and communications. Students found to have violated rules regarding academic integrity may be failed in a course, which is permanently recorded on the transcript. Expulsion from the academic unit and the institution and revocation of degrees have also occurred for such serious violations.

- The Team and ASU discovered in the course of the visit that because ASU does not consider intercollegiate athletics “extracurricular activities,” a student-athlete receiving a grade of XE on his or her transcript, a grade signifying “failure due to academic dishonesty,” may face different consequences than a student with an XE grade who is not an athlete. According to the Self-Study, ASU prohibits a student with an XE from representing ASU in any extracurricular activity or running for or holding office in any recognized student organization. An athletic team may have an equally stringent, sport-specific policy for its student-athletes, or not. ASU’s Student-Athlete Code of Conduct policy (ICA 401 and 401A) classifies a breach of academic integrity as a secondary violation, presumptively sanctioned with a one-game suspension. ASU may wish to revisit its Student-Athlete Code of Conduct policy to establish more consistency across extra-curricular activities and intercollegiate athletics as well as within intercollegiate athletics.

- Some people mentioned that “pockets” of faculty seem resistant to institutional rules and practices related to, for example, proper expenditures of funds, students’ academic honesty, and other integrity issues. Enlisting the targeted support of program heads, deans, and others to reinforce the importance of properly dealing with these details is needed to improve consistency and fairness, which clearly matter to the individuals with whom the Team met.

- The plan of the Environmental Health and Safety to use Compliance Officers, specially trained members of laboratories, to report issues of safety to reduce their need for inspections is to be commended as a means of filling a gap in the number of inspections that can be done with current staff. This is a short-term solution and needs to be corrected in the near future.

Team Determination on Criterion Two:

Criterion is met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

As noted above, this institution devotes remarkable focus to integrity in all its forms and at all levels. Staff and faculty conveyed a passionate and personal dedication to the integrity realms for which they have responsibility. Many of the staff members are impressive and long-time ASU employees who collaborate well with their colleagues, are recognized problem-solvers, and have expertise navigating and using ASU’s extensive collection of
policies on ethics and compliance. ASU also seems to benefit from an engaged faculty committed to teaching and modeling ethics. The Board of Regents as now constituted serves ASU well. Arizona State University clearly and unequivocally meets the expectations of Criterion 2.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

- ASU has an adequate review and approval process for new courses and programs with appropriate faculty control, as well as unit and campus oversight. Its 376 degree programs undergo rigorous review at the department, college, and Office of the Provost levels. Extensive internal and external program reviews are conducted every seven years to complement periodic specialized accreditation reviews by outside professional bodies.

- Program-level learning goals are articulated differentially for undergraduate and graduate degree programs and are consistent across all modes of delivery. Program-level assessment of student learning is expected to include data from students enrolled at each of the four locations and across modes of curriculum delivery to support its model of “One University in Many Places”.

- A review of documents provided by ASU shows that the design of its on-line courses adopts the Quality Matters (QM) standards that aim at promoting student learner engagement, providing tools and information they need to be successful learners. Development of learning activities and assessment in those online courses follow the QM learning objectives and planning guidelines that aim to align them with learning objectives.

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:** Core Component is met

**Evidence:**

- The ASU General Studies Requirements state that all students have to “gain mastery of critical learning skills, investigate the traditional branches of knowledge, and develop the broad perspectives that frees one to appreciate diversity and change across time, culture and national boundary”. Five general studies core areas and three awareness areas guide the development of courses that comprise general education. General studies courses are reviewed and approved by the General Studies Council comprised of faculty members.

- ASU, in addition, has articulated six "Sun Devil Domains of Proficiency" that represent a student-friendly, accessible expression of the institution's perspective on "ASU Achievers" of knowledge and skills essential to undergraduate education: Communication, Collaboration/Team Work, Computing Skills, Leadership Skills, Professional Development, and Global/Community Awareness. The latter set of outcomes is incorporated into publications and is distributed as a presentation intended to help instructors, advisors, and others talk with students about their overarching learning experiences (https://provost.asu.edu/undergraduate).

- Very close collaboration with surrounding community colleges ensures consistency of broad learning skills for students planning to transfer to ASU. The eAdvisor, now made available to students at the community colleges, enables them to best prepare for their transition, if admitted later to ASU.

- ASU has experienced a significant increase in research expenditures since FY 2002. In addition to supporting graduate training, research opportunities are made available to many undergraduate students. Interdisciplinary projects such as the SHADES multicultural program and research involvement available through the SOLUR (School of Life Sciences Undergraduate Research) website connect students with peer mentors and faculty researchers respectively. ASU data show that between 2009 and 2012, 49% of graduating seniors had participated in a research project or program (excluding being a subject in psychology experiments, doing laboratory
work for a course, or similar experiences).

- Service learning, capstone courses, and internships connect classroom learning to hands-on experiences within the growing communities. Strategic placement of degree programs across four geographical locations creates opportunities for students to garner internships and engage in service learning and entrepreneurship with local businesses. The Polytechnic campus, for example, holds regular events hosting community leaders including the Mayor of Mesa and education and business leaders providing opportunity for students to engage local communities. ASU data show that between 2009 and 2012, over 50% of its graduating students had one or more internship experiences.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

- When faced with substantial state appropriation reductions beginning in AY 2008, ASU was forced to make considerable reductions in staffing levels. By the start of 2012, a total of 2,055 positions that existed in FY 2008 had been eliminated, and this included an approximate 7% reduction in the number of faculty. While some tenured faculty chose to retire, the majority of the reduction was primarily among non-tenure track faculty. In this same period student enrollment has increased quite significantly, and to minimize the increase in the overall student-faculty ratio, the University eliminated or consolidated a number of its academic programs and increased the teaching load for some faculty. In addition, many programs have incorporated new learning technologies that enable faculty to teach more effectively to a greater number of students. Classrooms for life science faculty, for example, have been upgraded with instructional technology to allow interactive learning in large classes. Such changes have minimized any potential negative impact on outcomes such as retention and graduation rates.
In addition to the budget cuts arising from the fiscal crisis that began in 2008, another potential threat to the ability of the University to maintain adequate faculty levels is salary compensation. The previous self-study noted that in 2002-03 the average faculty salary at ASU ranked last among its 16 approved peers. While there have been no raises for the past 5 years, the comparative ranking of the average faculty salaries has increased to 14 among the peer list. In spite of the comparatively lower salaries a very high proportion of the current faculty hold doctorate, professional masters, terminal degrees and other masters degrees. Furthermore, ASU utilizes regular and rigorous evaluation processes including annual performance, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure reviews, to ensure that faculty are effective teachers and researchers who are current in their disciplines.

The University acknowledges an interrelationship between student success and faculty success and has committed valuable resources to support the success of both groups. It has developed a broad array of effective training and development programs, as well as mentoring programs, to assist in the professional development of faculty. This includes training, in all areas, related to grant submission and management, providing funding for seed grants, and instruction in the use of technological advances in teaching pedagogies. Another particularly valuable resource for faculty success is the ASU Commission on the Status of Women that, among its many activities, has assisted in the career development of many faculty and indeed most Schools and Colleges have been very successful in attaining gender balance among their faculty across ranks. The success of all of these activities is illustrated by the high proportion of faculty who successfully undergo the tenure process in a timely manner.

**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:** Core Component is met

**Evidence:**

- The student-centric focus of ASU is highlighted in many of the novel, innovative and
effective learning and support services. For example, the eAdvisor software allows prospective students to explore and plan their curriculum even before they arrive on campus, and they continue to use this tool during their studies to track and monitor their progress toward their degree. Similarly the Retention Dashboard enables the University to identify individual students, particularly newly-arrived freshmen, who have not been effectively integrated into the academic and social aspects of college life. Together with the Early Alert system, the Retention Dashboard provides a powerful system to not only identify “at risk” students, but also to monitor the effectiveness of intervention strategies.

- While the enrollment of undergraduate students has risen dramatically, the University has been very responsive in providing academic support services such as tutoring, supplemental instruction and advisors. Data from the annual surveys of graduating seniors over the last three years show that the overwhelming majority of students are satisfied with the assistance provided by advisors and the advisors are organized into a network through the College of Advisors that meets regularly to discuss emerging challenges and solutions. In addition, the University has established an impressive array of support services catering to specific populations of learners such as adult learners, disabled students, and veterans, at its four campuses.

- With the dramatic cuts in state support, the University increased tuition, but it has been able to maintain its commitment to providing access to an expanding student population, by making more funding available - offering significant scholarships, assistantships and employment opportunities to a large proportion of students.

- The University is very mindful in acknowledging that increased enrollment growth is accompanied by an increase in the need to provide resources and learning opportunities outside the conventional classroom. The University has the capacity for increased growth of the physical resources and infrastructure at all four of its campuses. All of the schools and colleges indicate that they have sufficient learning resources such as laboratories, access to technology and supporting libraries to accommodate further enrollment growth. The schools and colleges are also doing an outstanding job in providing research, co-curricular and experiential learning opportunities that enrich the learning experience of all students. Some notable examples are the connections with media and communication outlets established by the Cronkite School of Journalism at the Downtown Campus that provide outstanding learning opportunities; the Barrett Honors College ensures that its students are provided with rewarding research opportunities in the chosen career path.

**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:** Core Component is met
Evidence:

- To expose its students to university life, ASU strongly encourages its first-time freshmen to live on campus. ASU data show that in Autumn 2012, 70.8% of them lived in residential halls. In addition, as described above, ASU students are provided with many opportunities to gain research and service learning experiences through its community outreach programs, student clubs, and organizations across four campuses.

- The University should also be highly commended for the commitment it makes to the well-being of its students. Through its proactive wellness health promotion program, ASU has added a wellness climate to the educational environment. Each campus has a “well devil” center. Student leaders are recruited to become “well devils”, promoting healthy eating habits and active physical fitness. Benchmarking of surveys of its program participants to National College Health Assessment has enabled the University to identify and address wellness related risks that are more prevalent at ASU compared to other peer institutions.

- The One University Many Places approach provides distinctive opportunities. One novel innovation is that the traditional arts and sciences programs are shared by faculty belonging to three colleges: the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (Tempe campus), the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (West campus), and the School of Letters and Sciences (Downtown campus). For shared programs there is only one degree, with the responsible faculty affiliated with multiple colleges. This is not a novel arrangement – every major university, ASU included, has long used this approach for interdisciplinary programs, but what is unusual is applying this model to core arts and sciences disciplines. Discussions with deans, directors, students, and faculty, show satisfaction with this arrangement. The programs are delivered and assessed as though offered by a single faculty who happen to be part of multiple colleges. When assessment reveals the need for changes, as with the beginning mathematics curriculum, the faculty and deans work collaboratively and successfully to revise and reform the curriculum in innovative ways. This novel approach enables the core disciplines to have thematic emphases, realized through electives and concentrations in majors, while maintaining cohesive programming that is consistent and high quality across all campuses.

Team Determination on Criterion Three:

Criterion is met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

Support of teaching and learning at ASU is appropriately aligned with the institutional mission of access, success and excellence. The University plans to further increase its student population. It has clearly articulated target persistence and graduation rates. Increasing faculty excellence, especially in the area of research activities, provides further opportunity for student success.
This strong campus commitment to access, success and excellence is clearly understood and evidently embraced by faculty and staff, all of whom devote considerable effort to increase student success. Sufficient resources and support are provided to students to further this mission. Numerous opportunities are available to students to enrich their educational experiences.

ASU has articulated three institution-wide learning priorities for undergraduates as well as overall aspirations for what learning should be achieved via completion of the General Studies requirements. The University is clearly committed to telling students what the General Studies program should help them achieve. However, like so many other aspects of this institution, that discussion understandably is dynamic and ongoing.

The Team notes and commends the decision by the University to undertake more effective measurement of student learning in three of these areas (critical thinking, writing and mathematical reasoning) that are the most fundamental (and which are most clearly associated with student success), via the ETS Proficiency Profile instrument. As that project moves forward, the Team recommends that the institution make every effort:

i) to connect, explicitly, these learning outcomes to the General Studies requirements;
ii) to expand descriptions of student learning outcomes to be achieved via the other General Studies requirements; and
iii) to articulate how learning outcomes in those areas might be systematically studied.

The University should also assess student learning outcomes directly tied to the general education outcomes, disseminate data garnered from such assessments, and engage in improvement-oriented study of student learning in the general education program.

Related comments are provided with regard to Criterion 4.

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:** Core Component is met

**Evidence:**

- The ABOR mandates that every academic program or unit engage in periodic, reflective reviews. Driven by that policy, as well as a deep institutional commitment to metric-driven reflection, each ASU department and program participates in reviews on a seven-year cycle. Each on-line program has a departmental home and is included in the review of its home department. These reviews are intended to provide the unit, college and university leadership with information that serves as a foundation for improvement, which can include substantial change (e.g., establishing, merging, or disestablishing programs). Units are provided with a program manual that offers a thorough overview of the process, from preparation of self-study to submission of reports by external reviewers. It contains clear guidelines and guiding principles focused on mission alignment, program quality, numeric indicators of student behavior, and resources. As the review process begins, the Graduate School and the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOEED) provide a template for self-study, accompanied by program-specific trend data on a variety of metrics believed to reflect program quality. The process includes year-long internal and consultative study to develop a report to be evaluated by external reviewers. The latter phase affords opportunities for discussion with leadership, as well as for feedback from the unit. The process culminates in recommendations and actions taken for improvement, the effects of which are monitored for several years. The team reviewed documentation for program reviews in progress and recent reviews completed, and discussed reviews with faculty engaged in those reviews and deans who receive those reviews. ASU faculty and staff expressed confidence that this process was functioning well and is regarded as useful.

- However, the team identified wide variation in the extent to which student learning (which is a required component of program review) is addressed in the review processes, either as an element that informs judgments about program quality and effectiveness, or as an aspect on which program improvement might be focused. Team members were informed that attention to student learning is addressed via annual processes, because the episodic attention that occurs in program review
does not occur with sufficient frequency or depth to adequately contribute to improvement in learning. The Team suggests that while all other aspects of program review are reported, and appear to be functioning well, the institution may wish to identify ways to more clearly include assessment of student learning in the important and well-respected process of program review.

• ASU publishes an informative institutional catalog, that clearly describes all policies relevant to the student experience (generally following a 'life-cycle' structure, from application to graduation and beyond); most sections include a long list of "Frequently Asked Questions" that seem to cover many, if not all, questions that might be raised by students. The catalog includes a comprehensive list of "Major Maps" which cover every academic program and offer guidance to students as they plan their course of study. As part of that guidance, ASU uses a well-structured, objective system for evaluating transfer of courses taken at other institutions. ASU has worked very closely with all community colleges in the Phoenix area to identify community college classes that meet the requirements for various ASU degrees. The Transfer to ASU web site (https://transfer.asu.edu/) allows a potential student to identify course equivalencies from any of those institutions. Students also are able to conduct a scenario analysis, in which they enter their background and ask which majors would be most appropriate. Given the size and scope of ASU, and its commitment to providing access to higher education for a wide range of students, such an exhaustive compendium is a necessary form of communication. ASU is currently engaged in expanding the reach of Transfer to ASU to help students in middle school understand various paths that they might follow to most effectively enter various degree programs at ASU.

• ASU has a carefully designed review process for curricular change. The institution provides faculty at all locations an online "Curriculum Changemaker" used for requesting changes to courses and curricula. The workflow has been designed to automatically align requests for curricular change, ensuring that course syllabi follow institutional policy, as well as ensuring that changes engage governance procedures such as departmental initiation, school/college review, and university-level review. Stages for review include attention to imposing reasonable course prerequisites. eAdvisor and the Degree Audit System also help identify "anti-requisites" (i.e., classes faculty and staff regard as essential to student success). eAdvisor also assists the institution in using meta-data to identify class paths that are especially likely to result in student success or failure. For example, analysis of student performance revealed that students who earn a GPA of <2.0 during freshman year or students who receive below a C in a particular class have been shown to have a decreased propensity for success in certain rigorous course paths. Students with such characteristics are automatically identified early in their careers, and are contacted by a coach who can help them consider future classes or majors in which they may have a higher probability of success.

• ASU maintains specialized accreditation for more than 44 distinct degree programs, including programs in the School of Social Work, School of Music, the College of Technology and Innovation, the W.P. Carey School of Business, the School of Accountancy, and the School of Health Management and Policy. A review of memoranda documenting the good standing of these relationships reveals that these organizations find much to praise in ASU's programs; in rare cases where concerns have been expressed by an accreditor, ASU has been responsive to requests for
remediation and response. Such issues do not raise any concerns for the Team about ASU’s standing with HLC.

Some accreditors require or have sought additional information related to learning outcomes, systematic assessment of student learning, and improvements to programs based on assessment. The Team reviewed relevant reports within the context of student learning more broadly, and notes that this interest from accreditors underscores the importance of ASU sustaining and strengthening its attention to institution-wide processes for measuring student learning outcomes at the program-level and for incorporating that information into program change and improvement processes, the better to maintain good standing in these important accreditation relationships.

- ASU extensively monitors the success of its graduates, by capturing a wealth of data about placement and post-graduation success, as well as via survey at multiple periods through each student’s experience. A wide range of ASU units participate in assessments surveys distributed to graduating seniors, and with recent graduates and alumni. Results are posted on a publicly accessible web site [https://eoss.asu.edu/cs/students/gradreport](https://eoss.asu.edu/cs/students/gradreport) and allow students to examine job placement, starting salary, as well as a range of other variables. Similarly, alumni are surveyed 3-6 months after graduation. Surveys address student satisfaction with the preparation they received at ASU and identify whether they are employed or seeking further education. An additional survey three years post-graduation is intended to assess the quality of the educational experience they received at ASU. Results from alumni surveys also seek to identify employment status and satisfaction with the preparation graduates received at ASU. Employer surveys assess how satisfied employers are with the preparation their employees received at ASU. ASU also monitors external data sources that provide information on ASU graduates, such as pass rates on external licensure exams. ASU takes pride in the presence of its alumni in program reviews, media rankings that reflect alumni performance, as well as competitive scholarships and awards (e.g., Fulbrights) received by students and alumni. These practices are consistent with the type and nature of monitoring used by institutions of this size and scope.

**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

**Evidence:**
• As noted in Criterion 3, ASU has articulated institution-wide learning priorities for undergraduates, overall aspirations for what learning should be achieved via completion of the General Studies (GS) requirements, and “Sun Devil Domains of Proficiency”. The latter represent a student-friendly, accessible expression of the knowledge and skills essential to undergraduate education; these are incorporated into publications and distributed to instructors, advisors, and others who talk with students about their overarching learning experiences (https://provost.asu.edu/undergraduate). Although the team found these multiple descriptions of "general education" to be somewhat confusing, it was clear to the team that ASU is committed to telling students what they are expected to get out of their engagement with higher education, and that this articulation can be a foundation for effective assessment. However, like so many other aspects of this institution, and as also noted in Criterion 3, the discussion is dynamic and ongoing, and the constantly moving parts seem to make assessment of learning a challenge.

The Team commends ASU for determining that the previous strategy was ineffective, and hopes that undertaking a more effective measurement of student learning in three areas that are most fundamental (and which are most clearly associated with student success), via the ETS learning outcomes project (critical thinking, writing, mathematical reasoning) will yield results that can be used for improvement. As that project moves forward, the Team recommends that the institution make every effort to connect explicitly these outcomes to the General Studies (GS) requirements, to expand descriptions of student learning to be achieved via the other GS requirements, to articulate how learning in those areas might be systematically studied, and to engage in improvement-oriented study of student learning in the program.

• ASU consistently seeks information about student learning across a variety of institution-level goals, which (given the scale of the institution and the scope of the goals) requires substantial reliance on surveys. Though surveys are an efficient mechanism for evaluating large student populations, the extent to which they measure directly student learning is limited. The institution is attempting to balance this reliance on indirect measures by requiring samples of students to participate in standardized testing projects which promise to contribute to assessment of student learning in relation to some of ASU’s identified institution-level goals. That effort is currently in testing phase, and the Team anticipates that soon the University will have captured data, undertaken analysis of those data, and will have started upon a variety of projects to improve student learning. Several efforts were under way at the time of this review to refine instructional delivery in key entry-level courses, specifically by incorporating "Adaptive Learning" and group and project-based learning in certain mathematics courses and to expand that approach to other large-enrollment, lecture-based courses. The institution soon will be in the unusual situation of being able to undertake comparative analyses of several different systems that promote learning and improve retention. The team encourages ASU to assess the impact of that effort not only on student retention, but also on student learning.

• Catalogue information on each program clearly presents what students ‘get out of’ the program (informally introducing learning outcomes in a colloquial way). Each includes information about the types of careers that students can enter with these
majors, rendering concretely the link between the academic and career enterprises. This information is clear, and likely to be useful to students seeking information about how particular programs might connect abstract learning to concrete outcomes. In light of the university's expressed mission to provide access to every capable student, this level of clear and widespread communication is a commendable and important component of helping every student to find not just a major, but "the right" major - a goal expressed by many of the ASU faculty, staff, and leaders with whom the Team met.

• Assessment reports provided to the Team suggest that more formally expressed learning outcomes have been developed by most (if not all) programs, and that most (if not all) programs are engaged (to some degree) in conversations about student learning. As described in the Assessment Handbook and the Assessment of Student Learning Report, the design of learning outcomes assessment is consistent with nationally recognized best practices. Learning outcomes and assessment are intended to be department-defined and discipline-specific and faculty are directed to review assessment findings on a regular basis and use findings for program improvement.

ASU has a commendable level of compliance with the requirement that units submit assessment reports, despite the fact that the reporting strategy itself seems recently to have received considerable scrutiny and revision. Such revisions to the process suggest that previous approaches were abandoned in favor of a more focused and succinct strategy. This change indicates that the institution is seeking to make the process produce useful information, and it is commendable that ASU has persisted in its efforts to develop a workable process rather than retain one that wasn't working as well.

Nevertheless, the quality of program-level information obtained through assessment, and the utility of that information, was hard to gauge from the reports provided. Team members were particularly interested in whether assessment procedures afford opportunities to ask important questions, obtain useful results, and apply them to program improvement - and if not, why not.

Although some of these reports were quite good or exemplary (e.g., reports submitted by programs in the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College, the report of the CLAS BA History, reports submitted by several language programs), a high proportion of assessment reports were deemed by ASU reviewers to be unacceptable and in need of revision. Team reviewers generally concur that several reports attempt to measure ill-defined or overly general learning outcomes, many of which seem to rely on course grades (with little context provided as to why course-level grades might be effective measures of program-wide learning outcomes). Some of the team's questions were clarified in follow-up discussion with the institutional director of assessment, who described the iterative process for providing feedback, consultation, and support to units engaged in the reporting process.

The use of assessment findings by departments varies widely, and level of faculty engagement in assessment processes is difficult to determine. While Team members heard some cases of individual faculty efforts to pursue excellence and innovation in their own courses, maintaining the quality of academic degree programs across courses and over time will depend on the collective engagement of
faculty at the department level. The Team found the reporting system in place at the time of the visit did not communicate effectively to outside observers the extent of faculty involvement in program-level assessment efforts or decisions about how assessment findings are used. Considering ASU’s dual commitments to excellence and access, along with the rapid rate of change throughout the institution, consistent, high quality, program-level assessment by faculty will be strategically important to ASU’s ability to proactively demonstrate that the learning represented by its degrees remains strong even as the size, structure, and governance of its academic departments have all undergone – and continue to engage in - rapid change.

In contrast to the variable quality reflected in the assessment reports provided, Team members' conversations with faculty and staff reveal that ASU pays considerable and "fine-grained" attention to student learning: from the marked success of the Adaptive Learning project to animated conversations with individual faculty who are measuring student learning in general science courses, in art and performance spaces, in capstone courses, and in research labs. The Team was impressed with the extensive commitment to student success through student learning.

Overall, at times, the Team found it difficult to discern from the reports and reporting process that effective, learning focused assessment was under way and likely to be used and useful for the broad variety of programs at ASU. Nevertheless, the Team saw evidence of an engaged community that cares deeply about learning. The weight of the evidence that emerges from this tension between reports and processes, and the Team’s conversations with staff and faculty about assessment of learning and its potential to contribute even more to student success suggests that the University will benefit by continuing to pay careful attention to developing a systematic and useful mechanism for capturing and leveraging the good work being done to understand and improve student learning, at the program level, at ASU.

- ASU uses a range of information-technology approaches to engage students. A large on-line learning community takes classes remotely. These are students who do not physically participate in campus events but complete all class work remotely. Each such on-line class is based in a department and the faculty who teach the class are part of the departmental faculty in some way. Enrollments in on-line courses at ASU are comprised of two populations of students: those who take most of their courses in a face-to-face classroom, and others who are fully on-line. A third variant of technology-enhanced teaching is a hybrid class, in which each student meets some of the course objectives in a classroom and others on-line. Student learning for all of these technology-enhanced classes is assessed through objective examinations, writing and other performance assessments, consistent with the university, college and departmental policies. The team reviewed syllabi of a range of classes and found that student learning assessment of these technology enhanced classes is taken seriously and is effective.

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:** Core Component is met

**Evidence:**

- ASU has articulated specific and measurable goals for retention and completion rates as a component of the institutional strategic plan. In nearly every Team discussion with University representatives (including students), the subject of retention and completion was raised, and all levels of the organization revealed their recognition and understanding of its centrality to overall institutional success. This centrality is perhaps best illustrated by ASU’s creation and rapid adoption of a "Retention Dashboard" that has become the most frequently used tool for engaging advisors, mentors, "coaches" and deans. Those people reach out personally to students who may be at risk of leaving the institution, connect with those students to provide support, references to appropriate guidance and services, or simply provide a friendly voice that brings a large university down to a human and personal scale. Through the use of well-designed technologies, combined with commitment to in-person follow-through with all students (not only those commonly identified as at-risk), ASU has done a commendable job of systematically identifying and addressing both academic and non-academic factors that can become obstacles to student success in their academic programs.

- ASU cites examples of marked success in improving student learning in mathematics courses, achieved via a new blended "Adaptive Learning" approach that allows students to progress through the mathematics learning objectives. This adaptive approach has been carefully assessed and the institution plans to expand the approach to other key, large lecture courses. Leaders and staff noted that this adaptive approach to the gateway math class has had a positive impact on student learning and has improved retention.

- ASU has taken to heart the dictum that you cannot change that which you have not measured. Retention initiatives include new programs (e.g., pre-college, college-readiness, and discipline-specific programs), personalized learning and online advising technologies that help students explore majors and identify their best fit, online learning environments to support instruction in key areas like Math and English, more customizable course periods (half-terms), and transfer partnerships focused on developing student aptitude and preparing them for graduation. This focus has paid off: ASU has significantly raised freshman retention rates, improving
upon the 1990’s rate of 68-69% to achieve the current rate of 83.5%. ASU awarded 60% more degrees in FY12 than were awarded in FY02, with a six-year graduation rate of 58.7% ('04 cohort) that is up from the 49.2% rate (94 cohort). These increases have been realized at the same time enrollments have increased. A review of institutional data comparing online and face-to-face enrollments reveals a high degree of variation between freshmen and upper division retention rates. Further, there appears to be differential retention trends for majority and minority students.

• The University Office of Institutional Analysis (UOIA) tracks a wide range of metrics related to and including student persistence and progress. These data drill down to information that can be used at school, college, and program levels. Further, UOIA shares this information on-line and offers support to units that need assistance in analysis. The Academic Program Profile maintained by UOIA provides a comprehensive set of program-level data on students, staff, and finance. The profile is used to support the review of academic programs (which is coordinated by the Division of Graduate Studies) - (http://uoia.asu.edu/academic-program-profile). Data maintained by UOIA are used also to support the institutional strategic plan, providing benchmark and progress metrics for gauging ASU’s achievement of its goals.

Team Determination on Criterion Four:

Criterion is met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The size and scope of this institution alone make assessment of student learning inherently challenging. However, it is an institution that is in the midst of very significant change in developing its vision for a New American University. The Team has no doubt that assessment of student learning is a key component of that vision. Consistent implementation of that vision across multiple campuses and evolving programs will inevitably take time.

The Team found ASU grappling with those challenges as it deals simultaneously with several significant matters – a recent, substantial reduction in resource base, a smaller workforce, multiple reorganizations of schools and colleges - all while maintaining its trajectory of increased enrollments. It is clear that ASU is committed to student success, and that its commitment permeates all documents and discussions. Arguably, success in achieving its mission begins with student retention and with a clear understanding of why some students succeed at the institution and others leave before graduation. This latter is, indeed, the arena where ASU has paid the most attention. As problems with attrition and easing the transition into college wane, however, ASU will need to ensure that it is effectively and systematically documenting what it knows about student achievement of program-wide student learning outcomes, and that it is using that information to improve
student learning, just as the institution used other customized metrics to improve student retention. The challenge will be to understand student learning on a scale that appropriately represents the number and variety of students, as well as the range of programs at ASU.

In that regard, ASU now has an opportunity at hand. The Team found considerable evidence that ASU faculty, staff and students take seriously and value highly the institutional commitment to access for every capable student. “One university; many places” might well be expanded to include additional modifying phrases to capture the spirit of this commitment to access – there are many ways for students to study and achieve success. For example, rather than assume that there is only a single and best way for students to earn a degree in a particular discipline, ASU has leveraged faculty interests in interdisciplinary and emerging areas and ways of learning through problem-based exploration. Team members were impressed by the extent to which a wide range of students could find an intellectual home in the many places where this University has taken root, and the Team is confident in concluding that there is mission-driven variation in programs available at these various places; in essence, though all students can find and be expected to meet a consistent programmatic core, they may take various pathways toward achieving that core. As Team members noted, this is “one university, many places, with many pathways to achievement”.

However, ASU faces the challenge of communicating clearly to a range of external audiences that all programs are connected to each other as well as to intellectual traditions beyond the boundaries of the institution, even though programs vary in mission and scope. One important mechanism for making these connections is the articulation of meaningful institutional and program-level learning outcomes that are achieved and measured in different ways at various locations. By understanding well what students are expected to know and do, and by measuring the degree to which they learn, programs can have high and consistent standards without imposing cookie-cutter uniformity on students, faculty, or campuses.

It is clear to the Team that this University is strongly committed to innovation and to adapting the academy to the needs of its students and to the public. That commitment will be the key to addressing these challenges: just as ASU invented the New American University, we believe it will find benefit in the opportunity to develop effective approaches to authentic and useful assessment of student learning that align with the mission of such a New University. ASU utilizes surveys extensively to ask students to reflect on learning. We suggest that ASU examine those instruments to ensure that they reflect an appropriate focus on learning (rather than on satisfaction or reported behavior). Further, we see an opportunity for development of new, innovative ways of assessing learning in very large and highly diverse populations. When we consider other challenges that ASU has addressed with creativity and innovation, ASU has both the
capability and interest to be creative and in developing an innovative assessment strategy, and the Team encourages that. We also see an opportunity to leverage the scale at which learning takes place at ASU. The University already mines student data to identify patterns associated with success (e.g., series of courses taken in sequence). This suggests the opportunity for research projects that retrospectively analyze performance of students who take a particular pathway as compared to a randomly selected group of similar students who take a different pathway, or large-scale projects which evaluate materials generated in key courses to evaluate learning, or projects that engage faculty in discussions of common learning outcomes for capstone courses or internship projects which could provide information about "local" as well as institutional learning outcomes. The Team was impressed that everyone at ASU is focused on student learning; the faculty is engaged, curious, and deeply committed to their students' success; and ASU has a history and well-established record for taking up seemingly impossible challenges. The challenge of scale-appropriate assessment of student learning will engage the creativity of the faculty, staff and administration at the institution, will improve the educational experience offered by the institution, and will make a significant contribution to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

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

Evidence:

- After several years of financial stress, the institution shows the ability to adjust to the new financial reality by significant growth in enrollments, tuition increases, restructuring, program consolidation, and cost reduction in non-academic areas. In the period since the last HLC review, FTE enrollment grew by 39% (nearly 20,000
During the same period, average undergraduate tuition rose from a very modest level (~$3,000 per year) to levels that are now in the lower half of its peers. Restructuring eliminated 9 colleges, 47 departments and 51 degree programs and resulted in substantial cost savings. In addition, reductions in non-academic areas have yielded over $7.8 million in annual cost savings. After several years of careful fiscal management, the University was able to propose to the Arizona Board of Regents that there be no tuition increase for the current academic year (AY 2012-13) following several years of significant increases.

Since 2003, the institution’s faculty FTE count grew by 535 (27%) in order to deal with the increased enrollment. During this same period, the institution experienced a significant reduction in classified staff (in part due to reorganization and outsourcing) from 4,826 in 2003 to 2,727 in 2011. At the same time, professional staff count increased from 1,535 to 3,256, reflecting growth in the support services for students and faculty. The self-study reported that in 2010, the student-faculty ratio was 23 to 1, among the highest of its peer institutions. Through use of advanced technology, such as the e-Advisor system, the University was able to mitigate staff reductions. Improvements reported in new student retention and graduation rates provide evidence to support the University’s claim that these reductions have not compromised key outcomes for students.

Since the last reaffirmation of accreditation, the institution has embarked on a bold plan for the New American University. The institution has consistently tested the goals and objectives of that plan against available resources. Indeed, this plan and vision provided guidance for the realignments necessitated by the recent financial disruptions and enabled the institution to make adjustments in accordance with long-term goals and priorities while responding to the dramatic revenue shortfalls from the state. State and regional demographics are favorable for increased growth in enrollment and in tuition and fee revenues. External research funding has grown at a remarkable rate, and the reputational stature of the faculty supports sustained funding in sponsored programs. The institution has created innovative partnerships with local government to help fund initiatives of mutual benefit, such as the Downtown campus. The state economy has largely recovered and appropriations appear to have stabilized, albeit at a lower level per FTE student. The evidence supports stability or growth in revenue streams, and the available revenues are aligned with the strategic objectives of the institution.

The physical plant has nearly doubled in the last ten years, growing from slightly over six million square feet to over twelve million. This includes an entirely new campus downtown, which focuses on selected professional programs. In an innovative partnership with the City of Phoenix, a municipal bond issue provided funding for the capital costs of this new campus, and a new municipal light rail line connects the Downtown campus and the Tempe campus. As the Downtown campus has already exceeded short-term enrollment expectations, the University has leased available commercial space until other new facilities can be built. At the Polytechnic and West campus locations, new academic villages are being built in partnership with private sector developers to support the concept of immersion education, providing well over 600 new beds for incoming freshman and an additional combined 124,800 square feet. On the ASU Tempe campus, the W. P. Carey School of Business is constructing a 129,000 square-foot state-of-the-art business school facility that will provide classrooms, a new career center, outdoor assembly areas, and world-class
conference facilities.

- The institution has embraced sustainability throughout the campuses. Building renovations as well as designs for new buildings have utilized energy conservation, solar and wind power generation, and underwater cold water storage for cooling systems. Through partnerships with external providers, the University benefits from several large solar “farms” on parking structures, parking lots and buildings.

- Support for IT infrastructure has been strong. The budget for the University Technology Office is approximately $60 million. There are over 4000 centrally-managed desktops for student learning, on a four-year refresh cycle. There are nearly 500 centrally managed, fully technology enabled classrooms, along with seven adaptive learning studios. Each campus has a disability resource center, fully equipped with adaptive technology. There are also two-year strategic plans for upgrade of the core wired and wireless networks.

- The technology infrastructure and support for online learning are largely provided by outside vendors, Pearson and Academic Partnerships. All technical support for online programs are provided by partners, with only support for faculty development and course development being provided by the University Online programs organization.

- The University mission has driven resource allocation and preservation, even when very challenging cuts were required. An example cited in the self-study was the institution-wide furlough of 15 work days for all faculty and staff. Employees accepted this emergency measure in order to maintain all classes, services and financial aid for students. In order to implement the reductions in staff noted above, the institution created Reduction in Force Boards to provide oversight to RIF plans; these boards included faculty, staff and administration to assure fairness. The estimated financial savings of this effort was $24 million. As a not-for-profit institution, the University does not return revenue to any other entity.

- While ambitious, the goals of the institution are within its capacity. That judgment is based on the progress made since the vision for the New American University was announced in 2002. As documented elsewhere in this report, many of the key metrics have been met or exceeded despite recession-driven budget challenges.

- The human resources policies and systems are in place to ensure that staff members in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained. New hires are brought through a one-day orientation to the University that reinforces the University mission and goals. Annual performance reviews are conducted for all staff to ensure effective performance and provide a path to continued development.

- The Human Resources department offers a range of structured training. In 2012, the office offered 86 skills-based short courses, enrolling over 1300 staff, or over 20% of the staff. Topics ranged from performance evaluations, to multigenerational workforce issues, to communication and dealing with difficult people. The Office has also undertaken a review of succession planning for key senior staff in Administrative and Fiscal Affairs, and instituted two highly focused, multi-day courses, “Mastering Leadership” and a supervisor development program. The former is by nomination
only, requires buy-in of the sponsoring department, and runs for seven days spread out over the academic year, and focuses on developing leadership and management skills in potential leaders. The latter is similar in duration, scope, and buy-in, but focuses on enhancing the skills of existing key staff leaders. Both programs are in high demand and have highly favorable learner satisfaction based on follow-up assessments. The institution provides generous tuition waiver support for staff and dependents, with the staff participation rate as high as 50% in recent years. By policy, staff may take up to sixteen hours of leave time annually to support continuous learning on work-related or university-sponsored development opportunities. Internally, the University offers a network of development opportunities for staff, accessible via the Learning Management System. Specific departments, such as student support staff members, participate in extensive and ongoing professional training during the year, including retreats, in-service training, internal newsletters, and wikis.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

• The University has well-established structures in place for faculty, staff, and student governance. All faculty are included in the Faculty Assembly, which elects a Faculty Senate to represent the entire faculty. The Faculty Assembly and Senate have oversight and influence on matters of educational policies, faculty grievances, faculty personnel policy, financial affairs, and other matters that have impact on the role of faculty in the University. The Faculty Senate is the agent of the faculty assembly in all these areas. It meets using distance technology so that faculty members do not necessarily have to leave their campus for meetings. Each campus elects a Faculty Senate President, and those presidents along with past-presidents and presidents-elect, constitute a separate, executive advisory body to the University administration. Each campus has an elected Staff Council, with a president, and the four vice presidents work collectively with the University administration to represent the staff voices.

Undergraduate students have an elected representative assembly on each campus along with a student body President. Graduate and professional students, in
contrast, have a single elected Senate with a Chair. Collectively the undergraduate Presidents and the Chair of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate constitute the student voice to the executive officers of the University, while the elected representatives provide advocacy and services to their constituencies. Both student bodies are governed by well-structured policy and procedures documents. As an example of campus-specific student governance, the students on the Downtown campus voted to have a portion of their fees help defray a bond for constructing recreational facilities.

All of the executives of the shared governance bodies – faculty, students, staff – reported strong interaction with one another as well as with the University administration. Indeed the soon-to-be implemented non-smoking policy on all campuses arose from collaboration between the undergraduate and faculty representative organizations. The resulting shared governance model, while complex, appears to work to the satisfaction of those involved, and demonstrably results in influence over institution and campus policies.

Conversations with the leadership of each of these shared governance bodies indicates broad satisfaction that existing processes are giving effective voice to constituent concerns.

• Under the oversight of the Arizona Board of Regents, budget processes are very well prescribed. The Budget Committee of the University reports to the President and includes all senior University administrators. Every University unit and function operates with budgets that are monitored by unit leaders as well as the Arizona Board of Regents oversight committee. Internal to the University, effective systems are in place by which revenue and expenses are available through reporting software tools. The Arizona Board of Regents also requires standardized reporting from each of its three universities. This includes financial projections, capital planning, and information technology practices. They also require that each university maintain an auditing office.

• A meeting with two ABOR members revealed a group that is well-informed about the details of the University’s operations, strategic goals, planning and financial status. While having deep knowledge and understanding of the University’s operations, the Board acknowledges its oversight role in governance and strives to enable appropriate institution-level governance and control.

• From meetings with students, faculty and staff at all campuses, it was evident that each of these groups is confident that its voice is heard by the administration. The President meets with the Faculty Senate twice each semester to discuss issues of University-wide concern, and answers questions from the senators. The President also holds town hall meetings on each campus each year to listen and answer questions. Student government leaders meet periodically with appropriate vice presidents. The University Staff Council meets regularly with the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. One indication of the effectiveness of these relationships is shown in the collaboration that resulted in the first salary adjustments for selected faculty and staff. As a result, after several years of no increases and one required furlough, about 30% of the faculty and staff with highest performance ratings received adjustments.
• The President attends the first and last meetings of the University Senate each semester to report on University issues and to respond to concerns and questions. The senior leadership, including the Executive Vice President and University Provost and the other vice provosts as required, are present at every meeting of the University Senates. Student government leaders and University Staff Council meet with the both the Provost and the Chief Financial Officer on a regular basis. The President’s office is directly accessible via an online forum. The President and Provost meet regularly with the academic deans of all schools and colleges.

• Shared governance under the One University Many Places approach appears to still be evolving, but all parties expressed satisfaction with the current status.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

• With clear mission, vision and goal statements, alignment of scarce resources to the priorities derived from these statements can be clearly observed in the self-study and supporting documents. Having faced some very challenging budget years in the last decade, these linkages have become even more critical for the University. It uses an annual “Strategic Business Framework” to provide a road map for the next year that maintains direction and momentum toward the macro goals set by ABOR in 2020 Vision.

• Evidence for the linkage of the planning and budgeting with assessment of learning and evaluations of operations can be seen in multiple places in the self-study and was provided in related documents and discussions with ASU personnel. The implementation of e-Advisor is one example mentioned earlier, as is funding for adaptive learning and other retention activities. The Provost’s commitment to funding the ETS Proficiency Profile, a nationally standardized yet relatively expensive examination, as a complement to the current senior exit survey, demonstrates ASU’s financial commitment to both direct and indirect assessment of student learning.
• Planning at the University is a collaborative and organic process that includes input from stakeholders both internal and external. The University maintains active relationships with legislators, their staff members and regional political leaders. Evidence of success can be seen in the vote to support a bond issue that defrayed the capital cost of the Downtown campus. In addition, the new light commuter rail specifically includes stops that link the Downtown and Tempe campuses. Another innovative example is the partnership with Lake Havasu City to pilot low-cost baccalaureate education, as encouraged by the legislature and ABOR.

• The Arizona Board of Regents established a set of 35 Enterprise Metrics tied specifically to their Vision 2020 mandate. In turn, the institution has mapped the strategic objectives for the New American University to these metrics. ASU has established forecasts for each of these metrics extending to the year 2020. The senior officers responsible for planning engage in a mission-directed orientation for resource-allocation, developing a Strategic Business Framework as part of a multi-year strategic financial plan to achieve the goals and metrics outlined in the Enterprise Metrics.

• Throughout the self-study and supporting documents, evidence was presented that confirms that the University administration is well aware of its current capacity, and is actively planning for the enrollments expected by the Arizona Board of Regents in the ABOR 2020 document. Planning is well underway to acquire such varied resources as residence hall expansions, technology infrastructure, expansion of three campuses, and growth in faculty. Acknowledging that state support will likely not approach levels of the past, the institution is planning for revenue growth through enrollment growth, on-line program and enrollment expansion, growth in international student enrollment and other income streams. The University is well positioned to continue its journey to this new future.

• The self-study and supporting materials contain considerable evidence that ASU is actively considering multiple trends that will have impact on its future. Ambitious plans include growth of on-line enrollments from 3,000 to 35,000 students by 2020. The curricular structure includes required courses in three awareness areas: cultural diversity in the US, global awareness, and historical awareness. These require students to think about major trends in our society.

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: Core Component is met

Evidence:

• The planning processes that have been in place since the introduction of the vision
for the New American University are comprehensive and mission-driven. Metrics for both inputs and outcomes are part of regular reporting processes and serve as input for ongoing strategic planning. Indeed, the University maintains databases and spreadsheets with real-time data, all mapped to the objectives, so that the administration has the ability to immediately respond to the changing dynamics as they occur. The University Office of Institutional Analysis is a central resource for collection, analysis and reporting on important performance indicators. This Office supports the University at all levels of administration to maintain a data-driven approach to planning and decision-making. At a more general level, the University offers an interesting graphic representation of its progress toward the Arizona Board of Regents 2020 goals using a pentagon graph to represent the 5 major goals.

- The University has embraced educational and administrative innovations, evaluated their impact and effectiveness and implemented major initiatives in its offering to students. The self-study cites the implantation of e-Advisor as one such major innovation. It represented a re-assessment of what was in place to support student success and revise according to research findings and educational principles. That redesign of advising was combined with a technology platform that covers all major factors that have impact on student success, from major selection and registration for correct classes, to defining the path to graduation. Two metrics are cited to support the impact of this system: first year retention improved from 77% in 2006 to 84% in 2010; and 85% of undergraduate students on track for timely graduation (2010). Within the curriculum, major innovations were applied to the introductory mathematics and writing classes. Departing from the traditional classroom setting, these classes are being delivered in a learning studio environment, aided by technology and at the student’s learning pace.

Team Determination on Criterion Five:
Criterion is met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The University has demonstrated that it has the resources, organizational structure and processes in place to support the pursuit of its vision, mission and goals, all of which define its vision for the New American University. Governance structure and processes are healthy and active for students, faculty and staff and representatives from each of these groups told the team that their voices are heard and valued by the administration. The Arizona Board of Regents is deeply supportive of this and other institutions in the state and is well informed about the University. They exercise their responsibilities appropriately without being involved in University operational decisions. In both its academic and non-academic operations, robust planning processes are “alive and organic”, and are consistently used to guide decision-making and continuous improvements. The observed planning processes are always linked to the macro goals of the Arizona Board of Regents to University goals. The Team found that the many faculty and staff with whom it met are deeply committed to the vision of the New American University and are actively engaged in determining how this vision takes form in their areas of responsibility. The Team found that there is ample evidence to support
the conclusion that the University meets Criterion 5 and all of its core components.

V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION

A. Affiliation Status

1. Recommendation: No Change


3. Rationale:

   Since the 2003 Site Review Team Report, Arizona State University has undergone dramatic change. A new president and a strong leadership team, with the support of the Arizona Board of Regents, have worked to redefine the institution as the New American University. In doing so, through two phases of planning, with newly defined mission, core values, and design expectation documents, it has a commitment to excellence, access and impact in all that it does. As a result, it has: undergone rapid enrollment growth to become the largest public university in the country; engaged in a substantial reorganization of academic units with growing attention to trans-disciplinary activity; developed a One University Many Places model that includes 4 campuses that are functioning well; and has developed partnerships at all levels and in many ways to help move the University forward. Throughout this period it has also responded well to two strong challenges: rapid population growth of the state and metropolitan area in which it is located; and the severe impact of the recent economic downturn.

   The Team engaged in an intense site review process, meeting with more than 100 individuals, and reviewed hundreds of documents. Clearly, it is a very different University than the one reviewed a decade ago. The Team concludes that the University meets all 5 criteria for reaffirmation of accreditation, and provides some suggestions in sections of this report for institutional improvement.

   Most importantly perhaps, the University now has the opportunity not only to share with other institutions the steps it has taken to become the New American University, and the lessons learned in the process – for example in its approaches to financial challenges and academic restructuring seen in Criteria 1-2 and 5- but also has the opportunity to assume a leadership role in how a substantially reorganized institution with such a large, diverse student population, can also be a leader in helping define next steps with regard to its commitment to student success, and the foundation it has established with regard to student learning outcomes. Examples of ways it might do so are provided in Criteria 3 and 4.

   As ASU does so, it can be a model for others - of varying sizes and missions. Institutions do not need to be exactly like ASU to benefit from the experiences it has recently undergone.

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

   Monitoring: None

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

   Monitoring: None
   Rationale:

**B. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action**

None

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

**VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS**
Appendix A
Interactions with Constituencies

Arizona Board of Regents: Chair, and a Board Member
Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Assistant Dean, Graduate College
Assistant Dean, Ira A. Fulton, Schools of Engineering
Assistant Director, Learning Sciences Institute; Advisor to Chicano/Latino Faculty and Staff Association; President, LGBT Devils’ Pride Chapter, ASU Alumni Association; Member of UBIQUITY
Assistant Director, School of Sustainability
Assistant Vice President, Education Outreach and Student Services
Assistant Vice President, Financial Services
Assistant Vice President, University Technology Office
Associate Athletic Director
Associate Chair, Department of Physics
Associate Dean, Fulton Schools of Engineering
Associate Dean, Student and Academic Programs, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Associate Dean, W.P. Carey School of Business
Associate Director and Architect
Associate Director, Academic Operations, Mary Lou Fulton’s Teachers College
Associate Director and Professor, College of Technology and Innovation
Associate Professors (2), (Hosts, West Campus)
Associate Vice President, Budget and Planning
Associate Vice President, Chief Human Resources Officer
Associate Vice President, Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development
Associate Vice President, Student Services Residential Life
Associate Vice President, University Business Services
Associate Vice Provost (former), Graduate College
Associate Vice Provost, Graduate Support Programs
Associate Vice Provost, New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
ASU Foundation: Chief Executive Officer
Chair, Department of Engineering
Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
Chair, Engineering – iProjects
Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Chief Information Officer
Chief of Police
Coordinator, Shales Mentoring, Graduate College
Dean, Barrett Honors College
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Dean, College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Dean, College of Public Programs
Dean, College of Technology and Innovation
Dean, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
Dean, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
Dean, School of Sustainability
Dean, Student Affairs
Dean, Student Affairs – West Campus
Dean, Walter Cronkite School of Journalism
Director, American Indian Studies Program
Director, Animal Care Program
Director, ASU Health Services
Director, ASU Wellness Health Promotion
Director, Academic Administration, Engineering Academic and Student Affairs, Ira A. Fulton
Schools of Engineering
Director, Academic Affairs, W.P. Carey School of Business
Director, Business Administration, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
Director, Disability Student Resource Center
Director, Division of Humanities, Arts and Culture
Director, Environment, Health, and Safety
Director, Fiscal and Business Operations, Student Services
Director, First Year Success
Director, General Studies
Director, Health Solutions
Director, Homeowner Advocacy Unit of the Civil Justice
Director, Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
Director, School of Human Evolution and Social Change
Director, Institutional Analysis
Director, Learning and Workforce Development
Director, Lodestar Center for Philanthropy and Non-Profit Innovation
Director, New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Director, Office of Equity and Inclusion
Director, Pat Tillman, Veterans’ Center
Director, Research Integrity and Assurance
Director, School for Engineering of Matter, Transport and Energy
Director, School of Art
Director, School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies
Director, School of Life Sciences
Director, School of Nutrition and Health Promotion (Host, Downtown Phoenix Campus)
Director, School of Social Transformation
Director, School of Social Work
Director, School of Sustainable Energy and the Built Environment
Director, School of Transborder Studies
Director, Transfer Systems Development
Executive Dean, College of Technology and Innovation
Executive Director, Student Financial Assistance
Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions
Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Executive Vice President and University Provost
Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dean, University College
Executive Vice Provost, Planning and Budget
Executive Vice Provost and Dean, Health Solutions
Faculty Leadership (Professors Represented – English, School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, Social and Behavioral Science, College of Technology and Innovation
Graduate Director, School of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering
Graduate Director, Department of Psychology
Graduate and Professional Student Association: President
Lecturer, School of Letters and Science
Lecturer, Division of Mathematical and Natural Sciences
Manager Data Analysis, ASU Online
Manager, Food Safety/Health Sanitation
Office of Organizational Development – 2 representatives
President, University Senate
Professor, Applied Sciences and Mathematics (Host, Polytechnic Campus)
Professor, Department of English
Professor, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (Host, Polytechnic Campus)
Professor, School of Earth and Space Exploration (Host, Tempe Campus)
Professor, School of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies (Host, West Campus)
Professor, School of Mathematics and Statistical Sciences
Professor, Writing Center, School of Letters and Science
Professor, W. P. Carey School of Business (Host, Tempe Campus)
Professor, W. P. Carey School of Business – Marketing
Program Manager, Indian Student Support Services
Program Manager, Graduate College
Senior Associate General Counsel
Senior Director, College of Health Solutions
Senior Director, Curricular Activities and Action
Senior Director, University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness
Senior Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services
Senior Vice President for Knowledge Enterprise Development
Senior Vice President, Secretary of the University
Senior Vice President, University Planner
Senior Vice Provost, and Chair, Department of Economics
Undergraduate Student Government Association: President
University President
University Registrar, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management
University Senate: President; Presidents of Downtown Phoenix and Tempe campuses
University Staff Council: Presidents of Polytechnic and West Campuses
Vice Provost for Academic Partnerships
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Vice Provost and Associate Dean, W. P. Carey School of Business
Vice Provost and Dean, College of Journalism and Mass Communication
Vice Provost and Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Vice Provost and Dean, New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Vice Provost and Dean, School of Letters and Sciences (Host, Downtown Phoenix Campus)
Vice Provost and Dean, University College
Vice Provost, Enrollment Management
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs
Technology Support Analyst, Principal, UTOP, University Common Computing
Appendix B
Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

HLC Specified Resources:

- **Computer Resources Policies**
  - Computer, Internet and Electronic Communications Policy
- **Criteria 3 and 4 - Face to Face and Online course and major comparison**
  - Online and F2F Data Tables for Phil (1)
- **ABOR meeting agenda**
- **Academic Advising and Co-curricular Activities**
  - Graduating Senior Report Card 2009-12 (Internships co-curricular)
  - Graduating Senior Report Card 2009-2012 (Academic Advising)
- **Academic Partnerships**
  - Signed 1st Amendment to AP 1.0
- **Academic Program Review**
  - Academic Program Review Manual (6-29-2012) Final
  - College of Nursing and Health Innovation
    - CONHI Unit Response to Site Visit Report
    - CONHI Site Visit Report 05-07-12
    - CONHI APR Self-Study Report-FINAL with Update
  - Department of English
    - DOE Final Site Visit Report 2 28 13
    - APR English 2012 Final 12-03-12
  - Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
    - HDSHC Site Visit Report 06-11-12
    - HDSHC Self-Study Report-Final
    - HDSHC Response to Site Reviewers Report
  - Physics
    - Physics Unit Response-final
    - Physics Site Visit Report 05-11-12
    - Physics Self Study Report-Final
  - School of Life Sciences
    - SOLS Unit Response
    - SOLS Site Visit Report
    - SOLS Self-Study Report 2007-2008
  - School of Sustainability
    - SOS APR 2012 FINALEDIT
    - Appendix B
    - Appendix A Concurrent
- **Accreditations**
  - 2002-2003
    - Arizona State University
    - College of Nursing and Health Innovation
      - Clinical Laboratory Science
• College of Public Programs
  • Public Administration

• 2003-2004
  • College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
    • Speech-Language Pathology/Audiology
  • College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation
    • Nursing
  • College of Public Programs
    • School of Community Resources & Development
      • Parks and Recreation Management
  • College of Technology and Innovation
    • Department of Engineering Technology
  • Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
  • W.P. Carey School of Business

• 2004-2005
  • College of Technology and Innovation
    • Department of Aeronautical Management Technology
  • Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts
    • School of Music
  • Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
    • Del E. Webb School of Construction
  • Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
    • School Psychology
  • Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication
    • All Programs

• 2005-2006
  • College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Division of Social Sciences
    • School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning
  • College of Technology and Innovation
    • Department of Technology Management
  • Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts
    • School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
  • Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
    • Counseling Psychology
  • Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law

• 2006-2007
  • Arizona State University-West Campus
  • College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Division of Natural Sciences
    • Department of Psychology
      • Psychology-Clinical Psychology
  • College of Public Programs
    • School of Social Work
• Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts
  • School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture

• 2007-2008
  • Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts
    • Graphic and Industrial Design

• 2008-2009
  • Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
    • Interior Design
  • Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
    • School Psychology
  • W.P. Carey School of Business

• 2009-2010
  • College of Public Programs
    • Public Administration
    • School of Community Resources & Development
      • Parks and Recreation Management
    • School of Social Work
  • College of Technology and Innovation
    • Department of Aeronautical Management Technology
    • Department of Engineering
  • Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
  • School of Letters and Sciences
    • Clinical Mental Health Counseling

• 2010-2011
  • College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Division of Social Sciences
    • School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning
  • College of Nursing and Health Innovation
    • Nursing (DNP)
    • Nutrition
  • College of Technology and Innovation
    • Department of Engineering Technology
  • Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
    • Del E. Webb School of Construction
  • Walter Cronkite School of Journalism & Mass Communications
    • All Programs

• 2011-2012
  • College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
    • Speech-Language Pathology/Audiology
  • Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
    • School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture

• Non-Academic/Other
  • Animal Care Program
• 2005-2006
• 2008-2009
• 2011-2012
  • Campus Health Service
    • 2005-2006
  • Counseling and Consultation (APA)
    • 2004-2005
    • 2011-2012
  • Counseling and Consultation (IACS)
    • 2005-2006
  • Intercollegiate Athletics
    • 2008-2009
  • Public Safety
    • 2005-2006
    • 2008-2009
    • 2011-2012
• Additional program reviews
  • SOLS Self-Study Report 2007-2008
  • Physics Self Study Report-Final
• Annual Security and Fire Safety Reports 2012
  • Campus Security Policy (edited)
  • Arizona State University Fire Safety Report
• Arizona State University Self-Study Report 2013
  • ASU Self Study Report 2013
  • Preface
  • Background
  • Chapter 1
  • Chapter 2
  • Chapter 3
  • Chapter 4
  • Chapter 5
  • Federal Compliance
  • Background
    • Background endnotes
  • Chapter 1
    • Chapter 1 end notes
  • Chapter 2
    • Chapter 2 end notes
  • Chapter 3
    • Chapter 3 end notes
  • Chapter 4
    • Chapter 4 end notes
  • Chapter 5
    • Chapter 5 end notes
  • Federal Compliance
• Federal Compliance end notes
• Preface
  • Preface end notes
• ARL Statistics Spreadsheet
  • ARL Statistics Spreadsheet (Access restricted)
• ASU Assessment and Student Learning Report
  • Report 2013
• ASU Online Retention and Graduation Rates
  • ASU Online Retention and Graduation Rates
• ASU Police Statistic Reports
  • 2012 Security Fire Safety Report
  • 2007 Crime Statistics Report
  • 2008 Crime Statistics Report
  • 2009 Crime Statistics Report
  • 2009 Crime Statistics Report
  • 2010 Crime Statistics Report
  • 2011 Annual Security Report
  • 2011 Annual Security Report
• ASU Policies Procedures Manuals
• ASU Resource Room "missing link"
• AAP
• ASU Satisfaction data
  • ASU Satisfaction data
• ASU's Assessment & Learning Report
  • ASU's Assessment & Learning Report
• Audited Financial Statements
  • 2008-2009
  • 2009-2010
  • 2010-2011
  • 2011-2012
• Boards and Committees
  • Committee Descriptions
    • Admissions Appeal Committee
    • Animal Users Advisory Committee
      • Minutes
        • 2010-2011
        • 2011-2012
    • Appeal Hearings Board
      • Minutes
    • ASU Family Resources Advisory Board
      • Minutes
    • ASU Foundation
      • Minutes
    • ASU Museums
    • AZ High school-College Relations Council
• Minutes
• Bioscience Institutional Review Board
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
• Campus Environment Teams
  • Minutes
• Campus Health Advisory Board
  • Minutes
• Campus Recreation Board of Governors
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
• Career Services Advisory Committee
  • Minutes
• College Board
• College Scholarship Service Assembly
• Commission on the Status of Women
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
• Committee on Academic Professional Status
• Committee on Committees
  • Minutes
• Committee on Research and Creative Activities
• Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
  • Minutes
    • 2008-2009
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
• Faculty Athletic Representative
• General Studies Council
  • Minutes
    • 2008-2009
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
• Governance Grievance Committee
• Grievance Clearinghouse Committee
  • Minutes
• Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012

• Institutional Animal Care and Use
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
    • 2012-2013

• Institutional Biosafety Committee
  • Minutes
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
    • 2012-2013

• Intellectual Property Institutional Review Committee
  • Minutes

• Investment Committee
• IT Leadership Council
• Library Appeals Board
• Martin Luther King
• Martin Luther King- Tempe Campus
• Martin Luther King-West Campus
• Memorial Union Advisory Board
• National Scholarships and Fellowships Committee
• Ombudspersons Committee
• Parking Citations Appeals Board
• President
• President's Professor Advisory Panel
• Public Safety Advisory Committee
  • Minutes
• Public Safety Advisory Committee- Poly Campus
  • Minutes
• Public Safety Advisory Committee- Tempe Campus
  • Minutes
• Public Safety Advisory Committee- West Campus
  • Minutes
• Radiation Safety Committee
  • Minutes
• Regents' Professors Nominations Committee
• Research and Creative Activities Committee
  • Minutes
• Residency Classification Appeals Board
• Social Behavior Institutional Review Board
  • Minutes
    • 2008-2009
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
• Student Media Advisory Board
• Student-Faculty Policy Committee
• Sun Devil Athletics Board
• University Academic Council
• University Graduate Council
• University Hearing Board
• University Promotion and Continuing Appointment Review Committee
• University Senate
• University Senate - Committee on the ASU Libraries
• University Senate - Executive Committee
• University Senate Meetings
• University Services and Facilities Committee
• University Staff Council
• University Undergraduate Standards Committee

• Budget and Expenditure Reports
  • 2007
  • 2008
  • 2009
  • 2010
  • 2011
  • 2012
• Bylaws for Faculty and Staff Assemblies
  • Academic Advisors Bylaws
  • Academic Constitution
  • ASURA
  • CAPCE
  • CLAS Bylaws
  • Mathematical & Statistics Bylaws
  • School of Music Bylaws
  • Shared Governance at ASU
  • Speech and Hearing Science Bylaws
  • Unit Bylaws
• Capital Programs Management Group Manual
• Capstone/research project percentages
  • Capstone/research project percentages
• Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence
• Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence
  • Classrooms at ASU
    • Classrooms at ASU
  • Common Data Set - Instructional Faculty Trend 2006-2012
    • Common Data Set - Instructional Faculty Trend 2006-2012
  • Criteria 3 and 4
    • ASU Online Retention and Graduation Rates (#7037)
    • Retention and Graduation Rates by Gender and Ethnicity (#7037)
    • Faculty and Administrators by Gender and Ethnicity byg
    • FTF in Residence Halls by Gender and Ethnicity
  • Current Institutional Catalogs
    • 2008-2009
    • 2009-2010
    • 2010-2011
    • 2011-2012
    • 2012-2013
  • Documents concerning academic admissions, good standing, transfer and completion policies
    • Policies on Good Standing
    • Policies on Graduation
    • Policies on transfers
  • Emeritus Annual Report 2010-2011
    • Emeritus Annual Report 2010-2011
  • Environmental Health and Safety
  • Examples of Major Maps
  • Facilities Maintenance Plan
    • HLC Maintenance Narrative
  • Facilities Management Manual
    • Parking and Transit Services Manual
  • Faculty Numbers
    • Faculty Numbers
  • Faculty, Staff and Student Handbooks
    • Police Department Manual
    • Facilities Management Manual
    • Environmental Health and Safety Manual
    • Capital Programs Management Group Manual
    • Student Services Manual
    • Staff Personnel Manual
    • Research and sponsored projects Manual
    • Purchasing and Business Services
    • Financial Services Manual
    • Academic Affairs Manual
  • Governance Documents
    • Annual report 2010
    • Annual report 2011
    • Annual report 2012
    • Bylaws
• Charter
• Membership
• Governance Policies Feb2013

• Graduate Council Minutes
  • UGC 8/28/2007
  • UGC 9/25/2007
  • UGC 10/23/2007
  • UGC 11/27/2007
  • UGC 1/25/2008
  • UGC 2/26/2008
  • UGC 3/25/2008
  • UGC 6/2008
  • UGC 9/9/2008
  • UGC 10/14/2008
  • UGC 11/4/2008
  • UGC 12/2/2008
  • UGC 2/10/2009
  • UGC 4/14/2009
  • UGC 5/2009
  • UGC 9/15/2009
  • UGC 10/6/2009
  • UGC 10/26/2010
  • UGC 11/30/2010
  • UGC 1/26/2010
  • UGC 3/9/2010
  • UGC 4/14/2010
  • UGC 8/23/2011
  • UGC 10/18/2011
  • UGC 11/29/2011
  • UGC 1/31/2012
  • UGC 3/6/2012
  • UGC 4/17/2012
  • UGC 9/11/2012
  • UGC 10/23/2012

• HLC Site Visit Reports
  • Visiting Team report Respond Letter 2003
  • HLC Letter of Accreditation 2003
  • Statement of Affiliation 2003
  • Report of a comprehensive evaluation visit 2003
  • Statement of Affiliation 2006
  • Visiting Team Report Respond Letter 2007
  • Visiting Team report Respond Letter 3-23-2007
  • Report of a Requested Focused visit change 2007
  • Approval of extended Accreditation 2008
  • Approval of request of Change 2011
  • HLC Approved Additional Locations 2011
  • Decision Letter 2011
  • Statement of Affiliation 2012
  • Organizational Profile 2012
  • Memo 2013
• Evaluation Summary Sheet
• Approval of request of Change 2012
• Decision Letter 2007
• Decision Letter 2011
• Havasu Location Invoice

• Information request for the ASU HLC site visit
  • ASUOnlineExpectations 6-11-2012
  • MOU and QM Rubric (Jan 2013)
  • ASU Online Use of Quality Matters

• Major Maps
  • West Psychology Online Map
  • Downtown Criminal Justice Online Map
  • Tempe Communications On ground Map
  • Downtown Criminal Justice On ground Map
  • West Psychology Online Map
  • Ex of Major Maps
    • Examples of Major Maps

• Master Plan
  • Campus Master Plan Update
  • December 2011 Master Plan Update

• Missing link mystery solved
  • Missing link mystery solved

• National Science Foundation FY 2011 Total Research Expenditures
  • NSF Fy 2011 Total Research Expenditures

• Office of Equity & Inclusion

• Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development Report & Sponsored Projects
  • OKED Monthly Report and Sponsored Projects Chartbood 12/2012

• Ombudsperson Committee Report

• Online Completion Rates
  • Online Completion rates

• Parking and Transit Services

• Policies and Procedures related to Curriculum Adoption, Review & Evaluation
  • Policies on Admission

• Policies on Learning Resources Including Libraries & Formal Agreements for Shared
  Use of Learning Resources
  • Continuing Appointment for Academic Professionals
  • Library Loan Policy
  • IP Policy Revision
  • Policy for Electronic Reserve ASU Libraries
  • Books and Periodicals

• Policies related to Employment, Orientation, Supervision & Evaluation of Full/Part-time
  Faculty & TA's
  • Evaluations of Deans, Chairs and Chairs
  • Reference Check and Background Verification
  • Evaluation of Teaching
  • Annual Evaluations of Faculty
  • Annual Performance Evaluations
  • Introduction
• Definitions
• Recruitment/Employee
• Nepotism
• Postretirement Employment
• Volunteer Services
• Reductin in Force
• Flexible Employment Program
• Alternate Duty Assignment Program for Temporarily Disabled Employees
• Program for Temporary Disabled Employees
• Consultants/Independent Contractors
• Preamble
• Annual Performance Evaluation
• Classified Staff Evaluation
• Employee Performance Evaluation
• Hiring Teaching and Research Assistants
• TA/RA Handbook
• President Crow Presentation
  • Arizona State University ASU Home My ASU Colleges & Schools A-Z Index
  • Directory Map Santana SIGN OUT Arizona State University HLC 2013 Higher Learning Commission Re-Accreditation Choose a letter or number below to bring
• Publicity
  • ASU Reaccreditation Slides
  • Continuing ASU's Accreditation with the Higher Learning Commision
  • ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY: THE NEW AMERICAN UNIVERSITY SELF-STUDY PLAN
  • Daily Sun Tear Sheet 2-3-2013
  • Daily Dun 2/10/2013
  • AZ Republic Ad 2-3-2013
  • Arizona Republic 2/10/2013
  • Daily Star Tear Sheet 2-3-2013
• Resource Allocation
  • Policies for allocation and use of computer resources
• Student learning outcome assessment data
  • F2F Grade Comparison
• Teaching awards and recognitions
  • Teaching awards and recognitions
• Title III
  • Student Fee Allocation Board
  • Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention
• Undergraduate research numbers
• University Senate Meetings
• Updated Institutional Snapshot
  • Updated Institutional Snapshot
Appendix C
Federal Compliance Worksheet