6. Based on the list of elements (*who or what*) that were scheduled to be evaluated,   w   y
   w   w   w s s   w   y w   w   w s   t *?*

   16 of 22 comprehensive reviews/PPA reports were appropriately completed.

7. List significant modifications that were made to **t   ss** if any   **t   t   y**   , stating the
   reasons for having made the modifications and the improvements, if any, that resulted.

   The deadline for submitting completed comprehensive reviews/PPA reports was extended
   several times for the purpose of substantially improving the completion rate. The number
   completed remained the same (14 of 24) from the end of May to the beginning of the second
   week in July, increased slightly (to 15 of 24) by the beginning of August, and increased slightly
   again (to 16 of 22) by mid-September. By the latter (final) submission date, there was decrease in
   the total number of comprehensive reviews/PPA reports due for the 2014 PPA cycle; this
   resulted from the decision to count a couple of reports completed as annual reviews, and
   pushing back the comprehensive reviews to the 2015 PPA cycle.

8. List significant modifications that have been made or will be made to **t   ss   t   xt**
      y   , stating the need for them and the specific improvement desired.

   Spaces for required comments from supervisors/division heads, and required typed names
   indicating that the report has been reviewed, were added for the purpose of providing a
   documented level of supervisory review for submitted PPA reports. This was needed, as no
   space for written commentary was previously provided on the report template, hence there
   was no documented quality control as PPA reports moved from draft completion through the
   oversight process and eventually publishing. Due to the large number of PPA reports required
   within the Academic Affairs division in particular, the vice president is required to include
   comments only on the comprehensive review reports, and may voluntarily do so on the
   annual review reports. There generally appeared to be great variation in the quality of
   responses to items across reports completed in the fall 2013 and spring 2014 PPA cycles.
   Requiring review by and comments of supervisors provides quality checks, and may serve to
   enhance the quality of submitted reports. Report quality and transparency (to the internal
   community, accreditation team members, the public, etc.) may also be accomplished by
   continuing to publish all appropriately completed reports on IPE web pages.

   Due to implementation of the IPE website, the IPE Office transitioned to a new approach to
   providing documentation regarding the annual PPA cycle: a web page housing critical
   documents and brief instructions, thereby providing a stable and transparent location to find
   relevant information for that year's PPA cycle. Rather than sending an email with multiple
   attached documents as occurred with the fall 2013 and spring 2014 cycles, an email was sent
   prior to the start of the spring 2015 cycle with a brief announcement and a simple link to this
   web page.

9. Please provide any additional comments about your CI process implementation.

The PPA process is currently in its third cycle of full implementation across programs, services and offices. Much has been accomplished in less than two years; the PPA process remains an institutional work in progress of making continuous improvement.