

The University of Tennessee

ACADEMIC
PROGRAM
REVIEWS

Office of the Provost
2007-2008

FOREWORD

Academic Program Reviews at The University of Tennessee date back to 1974, when a regular review of doctoral programs was begun. In 1979, this was expanded to include undergraduate and master's-level work, and since then the program has evolved to its present format, a comprehensive examination of each academic unit held once every ten years.

The most significant recent change in Academic Program Reviews came in 1998, when the process was revised to reflect concerns stemming from the campus-wide evaluation of academic programs undertaken by the deans in 1996-97. To some of the basic questions that have long been part of the review process, asking for assessments of the program's strengths and recommendations for its improvement, were added questions found in this document that focus on quality assessment. We request that reviewers give their candid judgments regarding program quality at the national level.

Academic Program Reviews thus continue to be the primary means we have to evaluate the effectiveness of our units in teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The campus administration participates in the reviews and treat both the process and the outcomes very seriously. Documents from the reviews, including the self-study, reviewers' reports, and follow-up discussions, are archived in the Provost's office and are referred to frequently. Even though there is never enough money to implement all recommendations, Program Review reports are considered when budget allocations are being made.

The people whose work makes each review happen – the academic units that participate in the process, the staff members who organize schedules, and the external and internal reviewers who share their expertise and judgment – are fulfilling an important role for the university. To them, we extend our appreciation for their contributions to improvement of the academic mission of The University of Tennessee.

Office of the Provost

The University welcomes and honors people of all races, genders, creeds, cultures, and sexual orientations, and values intellectual curiosity, pursuit of knowledge, and academic freedom and integrity.

The University of Tennessee does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, disability or veteran status in provision of educational programs and services or employment opportunities and benefits. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex or disability in its education programs and activities pursuant to the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

Inquiries and charges of violation concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, ADA or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) or any of the other above referenced policies should be directed to the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), 1840 Melrose Avenue, Knoxville, TN 37996-3560, telephone (865) 974-2498 (V/TTY available) or 974-2440. Requests for accommodation of a disability should be directed to the ADA Coordinator at the UTK Office of Human Resources, 600 Henley Street, Knoxville, TN 37996-4125.

CONTENTS

SECTION I • ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

A. Background	2
B. Responsibilities	2
C. Performance Funding	4
D. Considerations for Reviewing Academic Programs	4
E. Timetable for Review	5
F. Reports Generated by Academic Program Review	7

SECTION II • MID-CYCLE REVIEWS

A. Responsibilities	8
B. The Review Team	9

APPENDIX I • Self-Study Document	10
APPENDIX II • Checklist for Undergraduate Programs	15
APPENDIX III • Checklist for Graduate Programs	18
APPENDIX IV • Suggested Outline for Review Team Report	23
APPENDIX V • Summary of Responsibilities for Program Reviews	24
APPENDIX VI • Summary of Responsibilities for Mid-Cycle Reviews	25
APPENDIX VII • Academic Program Review Model Schedule	26
APPENDIX VIII • Mid-Cycle Review Model Schedule	29

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

SECTION I • ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Academic program reviews are designed to improve the quality of the university's academic offerings, to achieve the best use of available resources, and to foster cooperation among the academic and administrative units. Reviews serve as a means to evaluate quality, productivity, need, and demand within the university, state, and region; to determine effectiveness and consider possible modifications; and to facilitate academic planning and budgeting. They bring to each unit the advantages of assessment from the perspective of peers outside the institution and colleagues from other units within the university.

A. BACKGROUND

UT's structure for academic program reviews has evolved over the last three decades, with the first comprehensive program review begun in October 1974. From then until 1979, reviews were conducted on behalf of the Graduate Council and administered by the Dean for Graduate Studies. While the initial focus was on doctoral programs, in late 1979 the review process was expanded to include master's and baccalaureate programs as well. Program reviews are now coordinated by the Provost's Office, sharing the planning, conduct, and follow-up process with the academic unit and its college. Beginning in September 1987, an eight-year cycle for program reviews was adopted, along with a system for mid-cycle evaluations. A ten-year cycle for full reviews was initiated in 1998, with a mid-cycle evaluation occurring approximately three years after each full review.

Well over 500 external consultants have served as reviewers, representing universities, business, industry, or governmental organizations from across the country. A similar number of UT faculty have served as internal reviewers. Academic program review teams examine programs in depth, and the recommendations contained in their reports have been important in supporting change. The emphasis of the review process is on improving quality through candor, cooperation, and communication. A summary document outlining department, college, and university commitments to program improvements is one outcome of the review and follow-up meetings. Implementation of proposed changes is evaluated by the mid-cycle review.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES

The program review process requires close collaboration by numerous offices and individuals. The successful conduct of a review therefore involves shared responsibilities, as does the subsequent implementation of recommendations.

- Review Coordinator

From initial planning through implementation, reviews are a joint responsibility of the Office of the Provost, the individual unit under review, and the respective college. A member of the Provost's staff serves as review Coordinator. Dates for individual reviews are established in consultation with the Head of the academic unit.

The Coordinator then holds initial planning sessions with the Head, the Dean, and faculty and staff of the unit, and appoints internal and external reviewers. The Coordinator works with the unit to establish the review team schedule, and during the review facilitates team access to e-mail, telephones, computers, and copies of past reports upon request. The Coordinator receives the report(s) of the review team, distributes it to participating individuals and units, schedules and participates in the follow-up process (in concert with the Head and the Dean).

- The College

The Dean of the college participates in the initial planning of the review, the nomination of individuals to serve as an external and internal reviewers, and meets with the review team during the review itself. After the distribution of the reviewers' reports, the Dean receives a copy of the unit's response to the report(s) and may provide additional commentary. The Dean chairs the follow-up meeting(s), helps to incorporate the review findings into the annual planning and budgeting process of the university, and has primary responsibility for implementation of the plan of action. The Dean of the college and the Coordinator share responsibility for planning and implementation of the mid-cycle review.

- The Academic Unit

In planning a review, the Head of the academic unit participates in establishing the review dates. (When feasible, these may coincide with accreditation or other reviews by external agencies). The Head also initiates a self-study of the unit (see self-study guidelines in Appendix I), recommends a list of appropriate external and internal reviewers, prepares a draft schedule for confirmation by the Coordinator, and plans local transportation. The Head oversees the final preparation and duplication of the self-study document and meets with the review team during the review. After reports of the review team are received, the Head responds in a written statement to the Coordinator and participates in the follow-up session. Faculty and staff members in the program under review are an integral part of the review process. They have the responsibility to provide input and to present information in the self-study document and are encouraged to participate in all aspects of the review process, including the review and its follow-up. Faculty may respond to the final team report.

- The Review Team

Two external reviewers and three internal reviewers normally compose the review team. External reviewers are professionals in the field under review, and at least one is from a university. In some cases, the second reviewer may be a practicing professional outside of academe. Internal reviewers are often selected from disciplines closely related to the program under review, although this is not a requirement. The wisdom and experience of a faculty member from a "distant" discipline may provide a valuable perspective.

The review team has the following responsibilities:

- a. Before the review visit, all team members are expected to read carefully the self-study document and to note questions and concerns to be addressed during the review visit.
- b. All team members participate in the full two and one-half days of meetings.

- c. At the conclusion of the review, external reviewers complete and sign the checklist forms required as part of program evaluation related to Performance Funding (see Appendices II and III for copies of these forms).
- d. The team agrees upon an outline of its report(s), develops a draft of the report, and shares its major findings and recommendations in the Concluding Session with central administration, all before adjourning on the last day of the review.
- e. All team members contribute to the final written report, which is sent to the review Coordinator within three or four weeks of the conclusion of the review. External and internal reviewers may submit separate reports or may elect to write a single document. A suggested report outline is included in Appendix IV.

C. PERFORMANCE FUNDING

Initiated by the state of Tennessee in 1979, Performance Funding offers a means of rewarding public institutions of higher education according to indicators established in consultation with campus representatives and staff of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). State appropriations for Performance Funding amounts to several millions of dollars for UT annually. The comprehensive evaluation of academic programs for Performance Funding comes through academic program reviews, where the external reviewers complete forms contained in Appendices II and III that are submitted with UT's annual Performance Funding Report.

D. CONSIDERATIONS FOR REVIEWING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

1. Program characteristics
 - a. Coverage of the discipline: general or focused/specialized
 - b. Emphasis: basic, theoretical or applied; teaching, research, service
 - c. Curriculum
 - d. Unique features
 - e. Enrichment opportunities
 - f. International dimensions or perspectives: faculty, students, curriculum
 - g. Off-campus, non-traditional teaching
 - h. Admissions and retention: standards, attrition, enrollment trends
2. Centrality of the program to university mission
 - a. Relationship to other programs: program duplication, possibilities for cooperative arrangements with other units
 - b. Contribution to general education for undergraduates
 - c. Inter-institutional relationships
3. Program quality
 - a. Program goals/objectives for instruction, research, and public service
 - b. Status of accreditation and other outside assessments of program
 - c. Quality of instruction and advising
 - d. Nature and quality of the faculty
 - e. Nature and quality of the students
 - f. Nature and quality of the curriculum

- g. Nature and quality of courses in non-traditional or distance education format
 - h. Quality of the program as reflected by student evaluations, peer evaluations, standardized tests, alumni and/or employer evaluations, national rankings or status within region, achievements of students and alumni
4. Program support and resources
 - a. Financing: institutional and external
 - b. Support personnel
 - c. Laboratory facilities and equipment
 - d. Library resources
 - e. Computer services
 - f. Space and facilities maintenance
 5. Program administration
 - a. Organization, management, direction
 - b. Faculty contribution
 - c. Student contribution
 6. Diversity issues
 - a. Faculty, staff, students, curriculum
 - b. On-going efforts
 - c. Achievements and plans
 7. Intellectual environment
 8. Overall effectiveness

E. TIMETABLE FOR REVIEW

The following are major steps in the program review process. A summary of responsibilities for the entire process is included as Appendix V.

1. The Coordinator and the Head of the academic unit establish dates for the review visit.
2. The Coordinator requests Collections Department to make an evaluation of library holdings relevant to the program under review.
3. The Coordinator, Dean, and Head meet with appropriate faculty and administrative staff of the unit to discuss the purposes and procedures of the review and to respond to questions and concerns.
4. Potential external and internal reviewers are nominated by the unit and approved by the Dean. The Coordinator contacts all reviewers. The Coordinator may select an external or an internal reviewer who was not nominated by the unit or the Dean.
5. A draft schedule for the review is developed by the Head of the unit and confirmed by the Coordinator. (See Appendix VII for a Program Review Model Schedule.) Responsibility for meetings and other arrangements is assigned. The Coordinator handles lodging arrangements and arranges for payment and reimbursement for

external consultants' expenses. Local transportation is provided by the unit under review.

6. Five weeks before the review visit, the unit under review submits 25 copies of the self-study document to the Coordinator. These are distributed by the Coordinator to the review team members, the college Dean, and other appropriate offices in central administration four weeks before the review visit.
7. On the first morning of the review visit, the team assembles for a schedule briefing and discussion with academic officers. (External consultants usually arrive in Knoxville the evening before.) The team then visits the academic unit for two days, including interviews with the Head of the unit, faculty members, students, administrators from the college office, and personnel from related programs.
8. The third and concluding day of the review visit includes a working session which provides time for the team to develop the outline of its report before meeting with representatives from central administration during the Exit Session to discuss preliminary findings, including any recommendations for improving the review process. The review team usually develops a substantial draft of the report at the working session. Before departure, the external reviewers complete the Program Review Checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as required for Performance Funding), returning the forms to the Coordinator. They also make arrangements with the Coordinator's staff for reimbursement of expenses and honoraria.
9. Within three or four weeks of the review visit, the team sends its written report(s) to the Coordinator, who then shares the document with the Head of the unit and others who received the self-study document.
10. Within one month, the unit Head submits a written response to the review report, addressing the observations and recommendations it contains and suggesting appropriate actions to be taken. The Coordinator distributes the departmental response to offices that originally received the self-study document and review reports.
11. The coordinator arranges a final meeting with the Head of the unit and the college Dean, who chairs the meeting, to determine which recommendations of the review committee are the highest priority for the department, college, and university.
12. The Coordinator prepares a brief summary document containing pertinent recommendations and proposed actions. Once this document is complete, it becomes the focus for the subsequent mid-cycle review. The Dean, Head of the unit, and Coordinator may also report to the faculty of the unit concerning recommendations received and actions taken.

F. REPORTS GENERATED BY ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

- Self-study document
- Reviewers' report(s)
- Performance Funding checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as applicable)
- Academic unit's response to review team's report(s)
- Summary document

SECTION II • MID-CYCLE REVIEWS

As a follow-up on the implementation of recommendations from the academic program review and as an indicator of current status, a mid-cycle review is conducted approximately three years after the full review. The mid-cycle review, a joint undertaking of the Office of the Provost and the college Dean, includes the following actions:

1. One of the external team members is invited by the review Coordinator to return to campus to work with the internal reviewers for a period of one and one-half days.
2. In advance, the reviewers reexamine all previously prepared materials, plus a brief statement of post-review accomplishments and continuing concerns prepared by the Head of the unit specifically for the mid-cycle review.
3. Meetings are held with appropriate department, college, and university personnel to verify the unit's current status, prospects, and problems. A brief report evaluating progress achieved and overall effectiveness of the academic program review process is submitted by the review team within three weeks after the visit.

A schedule of mid-cycle reviews is maintained by the review coordinator.

A. RESPONSIBILITIES

The summary document that results from consideration of all academic program review materials forms the basis for the subsequent mid-cycle review. The mid-cycle review is scheduled approximately three years from the initial visit. As with academic program reviews, the mid-cycle review requires close collaboration between administrative offices and shared responsibilities for implementation of improvements.

1. The Coordinator

The Coordinator cooperates with the Dean of the college to implement the mid-cycle review. In a planning meeting set approximately six months before the review date, the Coordinator, college Dean, department Head, and others as appropriate, discuss the assignment of overall responsibilities and procedures for the mid-cycle review. The Coordinator contacts the external and internal reviewers to request their participation and confirms the dates and arrangements. The Coordinator distributes the original review reports, the summary document, the unit update report, and mid-cycle review schedule to review participants and other appropriate persons.

During the review, the Coordinator and Dean work with the review team to guide the process. The Coordinator chairs the orientation meeting and concluding session. After the chair of the review team submits the mid-cycle report, the Coordinator distributes copies to the Head, the college Dean, internal reviewers, and other participants.

2. The Dean

The Dean of the college shares responsibility with the Coordinator for planning and implementation of the mid-cycle review. The Dean hosts the dinner scheduled at the end of the first day and, in conjunction with the academic unit, concludes the mid-cycle review by addressing the recommendations in the reviewers' report.

3. The Academic Unit

While planning for the mid-cycle review, the Head of the academic unit prepares an update report of no more than 10 pages to summarize changes that have occurred in the unit. This report focuses on changes resulting from academic program review recommendations as noted in the summary document, and should include other changes as well. A mid-cycle model schedule is contained in Appendix VIII. In consultation with the college Dean, the Head is responsible for scheduling and arranging all meetings within the college, contacting those who will participate and reserving rooms for departmental and college meetings.

B. THE REVIEW TEAM

The three internal reviewers and one of the external reviewers from the original academic program review compose the mid-cycle review team. If not all of the original internal reviewers are available to participate, the Coordinator enlists other faculty members to create a review team with a minimum of three members. The external member serves as chair of the mid-cycle review team and coordinates production of the final report.

Using the academic program review findings and departmental update, the mid-cycle review team assesses the progress made by the academic unit, the college, and central administration in addressing earlier recommendations. Within three weeks of the visit, the review team submits a brief written report to the Coordinator, commenting on progress made in addressing the plan of action as stated in the summary document and any other pertinent findings, even if not related to the original review. In anticipation of the next academic program review, the team should raise questions for the academic unit to address about the program's effectiveness in reaching goals and objectives.

APPENDIX I • SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT

Each academic unit prepares a Self-Study Document prior to the review so that copies may be distributed to members of the review team and others at least four weeks before the on-campus visit. The self-study should be written only after frank and open discussion by faculty in the unit as they prepare for the review.

The outline presented here provides broad guidelines for a self-study. Given the diversity of programs, the outline cannot apply equally to all, so academic departments should feel free to adjust its content as necessary. In writing the report, units should respond to considerations listed in Section D as well as to all the items included on the Performance Funding checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (Appendices II and III). The self-study should be a concise summary, on the order of 30 pages, rather than an exhaustively detailed report. Supplemental information should be placed in the Appendix and may be made available in a resource room at the time of the Academic Program Review.

1. Description of the Academic Unit

a.	Vision and mission	
b.	Scope and emphasis	Breadth and depth of program Describe emphasis on preparation for teaching, research and/or public service
c.	Special features	Unique components, distinctive innovations
d.	Diversity initiatives	Curriculum, students, faculty
e.	Curriculum	Nature and quality, general goals and overview Assessment of curriculum and quality of instruction
f.	Enrichment opportunities	Special events, activities and programs that enhance the academic environment and quality of the program, such as a lecture series of visiting faculty
g.	General education	Contributions to undergraduate general education
h.	Connections	Relationships with other units on campus, outside constituents, professional community, etc.
i.	Non-traditional instruction	Distance and continuing education efforts
j.	Faculty	Overall description related to strengths and specialties Efforts for faculty recruitment, development, and mentoring Work load

k.	Admissions/retention	Undergraduate admissions standards and procedures Graduate admissions standards and procedures Recruitment efforts Retention efforts
l.	Accreditation	Status as applicable
m.	History and background	Critical events/background information which will help in understanding the unit
n.	Demand for program	Community, state, and regional demand
o.	Other information	

2. Centrality of the Academic Unit to University Mission

a.	Teaching	Nature and quality of efforts in teaching Desired outcomes of teaching Process to evaluate teaching outcomes (e.g., results of Comprehensive examinations, major field test, regional/national competitions, documentation of placement and career success of graduates, etc.) Assessments of teaching: students, faculty, alumni Nature of graduate theses and dissertations Innovations and efforts to improve teaching
b.	Advising	Nature of undergraduate and graduate student advising Effectiveness of advising Innovations and efforts to improve advising
c.	Service	Nature and quality of service to the university and discipline Quantity and quality of outreach and community service Interrelationship of public service with research and other aspects of the program
d.	Quality Enhancement Plan	International and Intercultural Awareness Initiative. Please indicate ways in which the unit is contributing to the goals of the QEP.
e.	Diversity Plan	Please indicate the ways in which the unit is contributing to the goals of the UTK Diversity Plan.
f.	Consortial Relations	The SACS accreditation process mandates that we “ensure the quality of educational programs/courses offered through consortial relationships or contractual agreements and that the institution evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the purpose of the institution.” Please list any consortium or contractual relationships your department has with other institutions as well as the mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of these relationships.

3. Quality (based on evidence from the past 5 years)

a.	National recognition	Rankings, if applicable NRC ranking of department's graduate program compared to THEC peer institutions.
b.	Faculty productivity	Books authored by faculty Refereed articles and presentations by faculty Faculty participation in exhibitions/performances Faculty with solo or invited exhibitions/performances Invited lectures by faculty National awards to faculty Research proposals and awards (the Office of Research will prepare a standardized report which will include information on awards by PI, as well as information about the number of proposals submitted and funded, and federal grants and awards. Comparative figures for the college will also be furnished). Citation indices Patents and invention disclosures Faculty workload Other indications of faculty work
c.	Faculty profile	Percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty with terminal degree Percent of non-tenure track faculty with terminal degree Percent of faculty approved to teach in doctoral program International teaching and research experience Other measures to indicate quality
d.	Student profile	Nature and quality of undergraduate and graduate students, using best data available. For undergraduates in the last 5 years; number of majors, entering student ACT/SAT scores and HS GPA, numbers of applications, % applicants accepted, % applicants matriculated, % women, % minority, % international, retention rate, number of degrees awarded. For graduate students in the last 5 years, average GRE score, entering student GPA, number of applications, % applicants accepted, % applicants matriculated, % women, % minority, % international, number of degrees awarded.
e.	Student support	Scholarships and assistantships Number and level of graduate stipends
f.	Student recognition	For undergraduate and graduate students, number of refereed articles, presentations, awards, national or campus recognition, internal and external fellowships, and competitive fellowships
g.	Graduate placement	Job offers (including post-doctoral appointments, jobs outside of academia), admissions into other graduate programs

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|
| h. | Student performance | Measures of student accomplishment (major field tests, licensure scores, etc.) |
| i. | Other Graduate Program Indicators | Average annual production of degrees (Masters, Ph.D.)
Average time to degree-completion (Masters, Ph. D.) |

4. Resources (based on financial and enrollment data from the past 5 years)

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Academic Unit Statistics | Data such as student credit hours, number of degrees, numbers of faculty and graduate students, budgeted expenses and incomes, sponsored project expenditures, F & A return, as well as comparative data for the college, is available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance. |
| b. | Budget data | Information may be available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance
Ratio of E & G funds to total program expenditures
Ratio of research expenditures per FTE faculty |
| c. | Space | Scope and quality of space for program needs |
| d. | Computing support | Equipment and technical support for faculty and students |
| e. | Library support | Assessment of library holdings and services |
| f. | Unit structure | Organizational chart of the unit, indicating all personnel |
| g. | Program administration | Organization, management, direction |

5. Summary and Perspective

- | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|
| a. | Speculations | Challenging the paradigms of the unit
Possible recombination with other campus units
Options for change
Future opportunities related to the University's areas of focus |
| b. | Strengths | |
| c. | Weaknesses | |
| d. | Future goals and plans | |
| e. | Diversity | Plans to promote diversity in curriculum, students, faculty |
| f. | Special concerns | Any items the program review should address |
| g. | Special information | Particular information for evaluation of the unit |

Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs

Institution: University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Program: _____
Title Degree Designation(s) CIP Code

Instructions for External Reviewers:

In accordance with the 2005-10 Performance Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable undergraduate program undergoes external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs." The Checklist consists of 30 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use the criteria designated with an asterisk (*) to assess standards in the baccalaureate programs. The remaining criteria, including all criteria in the fifth category, Support, will be used by the institution, but will not be included in the overall assessment reported to THEC.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a Self Study document. Supporting documents will be available as specified in the self study. As the external reviewer, you should evaluate this evidence and any other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each criterion within the six standards in the table that follows. If a particular criterion should be inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked "NA".

This evaluation becomes a part of the record of the academic program review. The checklist will be shared with the department, the college and central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. When combined with the written report, prepared by the entire program review committee, the checklist will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria designated by an asterisk on this form (see standards 1-5) will be used in allocating state funds for the university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s):

Name

Name

Title

Title

Institution

Institution

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

Institution: _____

Program: _____
Title Degree Designation(s) CIP Code

Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs

Criteria for			Evaluation Results	
			Met	Not Met
1. PROGRAM OUTCOMES				
*	1.1	Intended program and learning outcomes are clearly identified.		
*	1.2	The program uses appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement of program outcomes.		
*	1.3	The unit makes use of information from its evaluation of program outcome attainment; student, alumni, and employer surveys; and university research to strengthen the program's effectiveness.		
2. CURRICULUM			Met	Not Met
*	2.1	The curriculum is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program.		
*	2.2	The curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly.		
*	2.3	Program requirements include a strong general education component.		
*	2.4	The curriculum includes a required core of appropriate courses in the discipline.		
	2.5	An appropriate balance is maintained between courses inside the major and outside the major.		
*	2.6	Curricular content reflects current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline.		
*	2.7	The curriculum encourages the development of critical thinking.		
*	2.8	The curriculum exposes students to appropriate research strategies fro the program area and students have the opportunity to participate in research.		
*	2.9	Students have opportunities to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.		
*	2.10	Students are exposed to professional and career opportunities appropriate to the field.		
*	2.11	The program uses appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement in service courses.		
*	2.12	Courses are offered regularly to ensure that students can make timely progress.		

3. TEACHING AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT			Met	Not Met
*	3.1	The program's instructional practices are consistent with the standards of the discipline.		
*	3.2	As appropriate to the discipline, the program provides students with the opportunity for interaction with one another, faculty, and professionals in the field.		
*	3.3	Effective advising is provided by well-informed faculty and/or professional staff.		
*	3.4	Library holdings are current and adequate to meet students' needs.		
*	3.5	The program seeks to include the perspectives and experiences of underrepresented groups through curricular and extracurricular activities.		
*	3.6	Students have the opportunity to regularly evaluate faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.		
4. FACULTY			Met	Not Met
*	4.1	The faculty is adequate in number to meet the needs of the program with efficient teaching loads.		
	4.2	As appropriate to the demographics of the discipline, the faculty are diverse with respect to gender, ethnicity, and academic background.		
*	4.3	Faculty are appropriately prepared for the level of the program, at least meeting SACS requirements for faculty preparation.		
*	4.4	Faculty are engaged in scholarly, creative, professional association, and service activities that enhance instructional expertise in their areas of specialty.		
	4.5	Adjunct faculty meet the high standards set by the program and expected SACS qualifications and credentials.		
*	4.6	The unit uses a faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.		
5. SUPPORT			Met	Not Met
	5.1	The unit regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.		
	5.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.		
	5.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.		
SUMMARY EVALUATION			Yes	No
The program meets or exceeds the minimum standards of good practice.				

*Criterion included in the performance funding calculation.

Checklist for Assessment of Graduate Programs

Institution: _____

Program: _____
Title Degree Designation(s) CIP Code

Instructions for External Reviewers:

In accordance with the 2005-10 Performance Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Checklist for Assessment of Graduate Programs." The Checklist consists of two standards: Objective and Qualitative. THEC will use the criteria designated with an asterisk (*) to assess standards in the graduate programs. The remaining criteria will be used by the institution, but will not be included in the overall assessment reported to THEC.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a Self Study document. Supporting documents will be available as specified in the self study. As the external reviewer, you should evaluate this evidence and any other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each criterion for the eight items under the Objective Standards. The 20 items under the Qualitative Standards must be rated on a 4-point scale ranging from "poor" to "excellent" (or "NA" for items which are not applicable to the program).

This evaluation becomes a part of the record of the academic program review. The checklist will be shared with the department, the college and central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. When combined with the written report, prepared by the entire program review committee, the checklist will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria designated by an asterisk on this form will be used in allocating state funds for the university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s):

Name

Name

Title

Title

Institution

Institution

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

Institution: _____

Program: _____
Title Degree Designation(s) CIP Code

Checklist for Assessment of Graduate Programs

Please indicate with a check mark whether each of the following **Objective Standards** has been met or not met. Where two or more conditions correspond for a given standard, all such conditions must be fulfilled to meet the standard.

A. Admission of Students **Met** **Not Met**

1. Admission standards are appropriate to the degree level.
2. Admission standards are stated clearly and are circulated to all applicants. Inclusion in the institution's catalog is sufficient to fulfill this condition.
3. Evidence exists that admission standards are consistently applied.
4. There is appropriate orientation of new students.

B. Supervision and Retention of Students **Met** **Not Met**

1. Retention standards are stated clearly and are circulated to all enrolled students. Inclusion in the institution's catalog is sufficient to fulfill this condition.
2. Evidence exists that retention standards are consistently applied.
3. Orientation, personalized instruction, advisement, and guidance are provided to enrolled students.
4. Students' progress is periodically monitored.
5. Time limits are appropriate for the degree level and are checked to ensure student's knowledge is up to date when the degree is awarded.

C. Availability and Sophistication of Coursework **Met** **Not Met**

1. There is a core of planned coursework appropriate to the discipline.
2. Courses are offered frequently enough to allow students to progress at a reasonable pace.
3. There is provision for planned disciplinary specialization beyond the core.
4. Courses are characterized by advanced disciplinary content and academic rigor.
5. In master's programs, degree credit is given for dual-listed (undergraduate-graduate) courses in no more than 1/3 of total hours required.
6. Sufficient distinction is made between coursework at the master's, educational specialist and/or doctoral levels.

D. Methodologies and Techniques of Discipline **Met** **Not Met**

1. The program includes tools, techniques and methodology that are needed to understand the discipline, undertake research in the discipline, and actually practice the education acquired.

E. Extra-disciplinary Experience **Met** **Not Met**

1. Some academic exposure outside the degree major or discipline should be available to students without increasing the total number of hours required for the degree. Among the elements that would constitute such exposure are related courses outside the major and internships or practice. In professional fields, students should be allowed courses outside their professional school.

F. Comprehensive Examination **Met** **Not Met**

1. At or near the end of all coursework, students should be required to take a written or oral comprehensive examination demonstrating the breadth of knowledge in the discipline, depth in specific areas, and the ability to integrate what has been learned, or to complete a culminating experience that demonstrates communication skills and the ability to apply knowledge independently.
2. A student's comprehensive written examination or culminating experience or the results of oral exams must be kept on file for a minimum of five years.

G. Research **Met** **Not Met**

1. Each student must demonstrate mastery of research in the discipline through thesis, dissertation, research papers, literature reviews, reports, or case studies.

H. Communication **Met** **Not Met**

1. Each student must demonstrate the ability to communicate, both orally and in writing, in a manner and at a level appropriate to the degree and discipline. Explicit program components should be designed to provide opportunity for this demonstration.

Institution: _____

Program: _____
Title Degree Designation(s) CIP Code

For each of the **Qualitative Standards** below, please provide a rating by checking the appropriate column.

A. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
*	1					
	There is a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.					
*	2					
	Prudence is exercised in the number and type of short courses accepted toward the degree.					
*	3					
	Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.					
*	4					
	There are adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.					
*	5					
	There are adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication.					
B. Graduate Faculty Quality		N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
*	1					
	Faculty hold terminal degrees in the appropriate discipline.					
*	2					
	Faculty academic credentials correspond to the concentrations in which they teach.					
*	3					
	Faculty scholarly activity is sufficient to serve as effective mentors for graduate students					
*	4					
	Faculty have sufficient practical/professional/academic experience to serve as effective mentors for graduate students.					
*	5					
	Faculty have regular opportunities for professional development, including travel and participation in professional organizations, workshops and other learning activities.					
*	6					
	Faculty teaching loads are consonant with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.					

C. Teaching/Learning Environment		N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
* 1	There are ample materials and secretarial support to encourage research and publication.					
* 2	There is adequate library support.					
* 3	There is adequate and accessible computer support.					
4	There are adequate lab facilities.					
5	There is adequate office space.					
D. Program Evaluation		N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
* 1	Follow-up data on graduating students are regularly and systematically collected					
* 2	The curriculum is evaluated periodically.					
* 3	Evaluation of placement of graduates is regular and systematic.					
* 4	Completion rates are at an acceptable level.					

*Criterion included in the performance funding calculation.

APPENDIX IV • SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Although each Review Team should feel free to modify this proposed outline, it is essential that the final team report addresses the following qualitative assessments:

1. Overall assessment of the program
2. Program strengths
3. Program weaknesses
4. Recommendations for improvements
5. Comments
 - Is this program making effective use of its resources?
 - Explain what qualities this program has or should have to be recognized as a program of national prominence.

APPENDIX V. SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Academic Unit

- Prepares and submits to Program Review Coordinator a prioritized list of proposed external and internal reviewers.
- Prepares and submits to Program Review Coordinator 20 copies of the self-study document.
- Prepares and submits tentative review schedule to Program Review Coordinator.
- Schedules participation by academic unit, faculty, and students.
- Schedules rooms for academic unit sessions.
- Arranges dinners.
- Arranges all local transportation.
- Submits response to the Program Review Coordinator within one month after receiving the review team report.
- Prepares summary document for review by the Program Review Coordinator.

College Dean

- Supplements and approves the unit's list of external and internal reviewers.
- Pays for luncheons.
- Chairs follow-up meeting(s) after review visit.

Review Team

- Prepares for the visit by reviewing the documents provided.
- Presents preliminary observations and recommendations to central administration at Concluding Session.
- External reviewers complete Graduate and Undergraduate Checklists at the Concluding Session, returning these to the Program Review Coordinator.
- Submits a report to the Program Review Coordinator within three to four weeks after the review visit.

Program Review Coordinator

- Establishes review date with academic unit Head.
- Conducts preliminary planning meeting.
- Contacts external and internal reviewers.
- Sends confirming letters to reviewers.
- Arranges and pays for accommodations and honoraria for external reviewers.
- Transmits academic program review guidelines and university catalogs to reviewers.
- Schedules room and arranges for luncheon events.
- Pays for dinners.
- Schedules rooms for all non-academic unit sessions.
- Contacts central administration regarding review participation.
- Transmits self-study document to reviewers and others.
- Confirms and distributes final schedule to review team and participants.
- Chairs orientation meeting, central administration meeting, Provost's office meeting, and concluding session.
- Reimburses external reviewers for travel expenses.
- Distributes review team's report after review visit.
- Collects and distributes to Institutional Research the graduate and undergraduate program checklists after review.
- Initiates follow-up meeting(s) after review.

APPENDIX VI · SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MID-CYCLE REVIEWS

Academic Unit

- Prepares and submits to Program Review Coordinator 20 copies of the update document.
- Prepares and submits tentative review schedule to Program Review Coordinator.
- Schedules participation by academic unit faculty and students.
- Schedules rooms for academic unit sessions.
- Pays for Monday lunch.
- Arranges dinner in conjunction with college.
- Arranges all local transportation.

College Dean

- Arranges, hosts, and pays for dinner, in conjunction with academic unit.
- Conducts follow-up activity after receipt of mid-cycle review report.

Review Team

- Prepares for the visit by reviewing the documents provided.
- Presents preliminary observations and recommendations to central administration at Concluding Session.
- Submits the mid-cycle review report to the Program Review Coordinator within three to four weeks after the review visit.

Program Review Coordinator

- Conducts preliminary planning meeting.
- Contacts external reviewer.
- Contacts internal reviewers.
- Sends confirming letters to reviewers.
- Arranges and pays for accommodation and honoraria for external reviewer.
- Transmits original review reports, academic unit response, mid-cycle review program guidelines, academic unit update report, and summary document to reviewers.
- Schedules room for all non-academic units sessions.
- Schedules room and arranges for luncheon event.
- Contacts central administration regarding review participation.
- Confirms and distributes final schedule to review team and participants.
- Distributes schedule and academic unit update report to review participants.
- Reimburses external reviewer for travel expenses.
- Chairs orientation meeting and concluding session.
- Distributes mid-cycle review report after review visit.

**(Model Schedule for)
Academic Program Review**

**Department of _____
Date of Review**

External Reviewers: Name , Institution
Name , Institution

Internal Reviewers: Name , Department
Name , Department
Name , Department

Sunday, Date

Pick up external reviewers at airport (Vice Chancellor's Office notifies department of the itinerary, department arranges all transportation.)

Hotel accommodations at the Crowne Plaza Hotel; (Vice Chancellor's Office will notify the department if accommodations are elsewhere.)

Monday, Date (Note: department arranges transportation for all scheduled meetings)

8:30 Pick up external reviewers at the hotel

9:00 a.m. Orientation Meeting, (List location)
(Room to be provided in department.)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
Dean of the College (List name)
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator

9:30 a.m. Tour and Overview of the Department
Review Team
Department Head (List name)

10:45 a.m. Faculty Interviews, (List location)
Review Team
Individual or group meetings as time permits

12:00 noon Lunch (List location)
(Arranged by department and paid for by college.)

1:30 p.m. Undergraduate Program Overview, (List location)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
Departmental Faculty
College Director of Advising (List name)

2:15 p.m. Interviews with Undergraduate Students, (List location)
Review Team
Undergraduate students in individual or group meetings

- 3:00 p.m. Break
- 3:15 p.m. Graduate Program Overview (List location)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
College Graduate Dean (List name)
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School (List name)
Departmental Faculty
- 4:00 p.m. Interviews with Graduate Students (List location)
Review Team
Graduate students in individual or group meetings
- 4:45 p.m. Summary Session (List location)
Review Team
- 6:30 p.m. Dinner (List location)
Review Team (only)
(Location determined by department. Vice Chancellor's Office to be billed direct and will provide direct billing forms.)

Tuesday, Date

- 8:10 a.m. Pick up external reviewers at the hotel
- 8:30 a.m. College Meeting (List location)
Review Team
College Office Representatives
- 9:30 a.m. Break
- 9:45 a.m. Central Administration ____ floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower *(Vice Chancellor's Office has reserved the room and notified Central Administration participants and the dean.)*
Review Team
Program Review Coordinator, Dr. Todd Diacon
- 10:45 Break
- 11:00 a.m. Faculty Interviews (List location)
Review Team
Individual or group meetings as time permits
- 12:00 noon Lunch (List location)
(Arranged by department and paid for by college.)

- 1:30 p.m. Faculty Interviews (List location)
Review Team
Individual or group meetings as time permits
- 2:45 p.m. Heads of Related Departments (List location)
Review Team
Department Heads
- 3:45 p.m. Break
- 4:00 p.m. Department Head Exit Interview (List location)
- 5:00 p.m. Summary Session (List location)
Review Team
- 6:30 p.m. Dinner (List location)
Review Team (Only)
(Location determined by department. Vice Chancellor's Office to be billed direct and will provide direct billing forms.)

Wednesday, Date

- 8:10 a.m. Pick up external reviewers at the hotel
- 8:30 a.m. Work Session, ____ floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower (Vice Chancellor's Office has reserved the room)
- 11:00 a.m. Concluding Session, ____ floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower (Vice Chancellor's Office has reserved the room and notified Central Administration participants and the dean.)
Review Team
Central Administration
Dean (List name)
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator
- 12:00 noon Adjourn

(Department arranges transportation to the airport for the external reviewers.)

References: (Please include on the schedule)

Department Head (List name, title, address, and phone number)
Dean (List name, title, address, and phone number)
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator, 521 Andy Holt Tower, Campus 0152;
974-3265

Note: Some departments list the external reviewers' arrival and departure information on the schedule.

Mid-Cycle Program Review Model Schedule
Mid-Cycle Program Review
Department of Animal Science
September 15-16, 2008

External Reviewer: _____

Internal Reviewers: _____

Sunday, Date

Pick up external reviewer at airport (*Vice Chancellor's Office notifies department of the itinerary, department arranges transportation.*)

Hotel accommodations are at the Crowne Plaza Hotel.

Monday, Date **(Note: department arranges transportation for all scheduled meetings)**

- 8:30 a.m. Pick up external reviewer at the hotel
- 9:00 a.m. Orientation Meeting, (List location)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
Dean of the College (List name)
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator
- 9:30 a.m. Department Head Meeting (List location)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
- 10:30 a.m. Faculty Interviews, (List location)
Review Team
Individual or group meetings as time permits
- 12:00 noon Lunch – (*arranged and paid for by department*)
- 1:30 p.m. College Meeting (List location)
Review Team
College Office Representatives
- 2:45 p.m. Break
- 3:00 p.m. Student Interviews (List location)
Review Team
Department chooses appropriate group or individuals
- 4:00 p.m. Faculty Interviews (List location)

Review Team
Department chooses appropriate group or individuals

6:30 p.m. Dinner (*Department head arranges dinner in conjunction with college dean. College dean hosts and pays for dinner.*)
Review Team
Department Head (List name)
Dean (List name)

Tuesday, Date

8:30 a.m. Pick up external reviewer at the hotel

9:00 a.m. Work Session, ____ Floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower (*Vice Chancellor's Office has reserved the room.*)
Review Team

11:00 a.m. Central Administration Meeting, ____ Floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower (*Vice Chancellor's Office has reserved the room and notified Central Administration participants.*)
Review Team
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator
Central Administration
Dean (List name)

12:00 noon Adjourn
(*Department arranges transportation to the airport for the external reviewers.*)

References:

Department Head (List name, title, address, and phone number)
Dean (List name, title, address, and phone number)
Dr. Todd Diacon, Program Review Coordinator, 531 Andy Holt Tower,
Campus 0152, 974-3265