THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE CHATTANOOGA

2020-2025

Academic Program Review

Graduate Program On-Site Visit Packet

Prepared by the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research (OPEIR)

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Overview of Activities 4
- Timeline 4
- Activity Details 5

Self-study Guidelines 8
- 2020-25 THEC Reviewer Rubric 9
- Self-study Narrative Guidelines 13

Additional Information 23
- External Reviewer Selection Criteria 23
- Reimbursable Costs for Site Visit 24
- Dean and Provost Responsibilities 25
- Program Information Provided by OPEIR 26

Document Templates 27
- Sample Letter of Agreement for Reviewer 27
- Sample Site Visit Itinerary 28

Introduction

The academic program review process is intended to provide faculty and academic administrators with information to identify program strengths and weaknesses. This information should play a major role in helping faculty to define initiatives, improve quality, and justify needed resources. Program review is perhaps the most essential component in academic planning.

What's the purpose?

In conducting the program review, the department will generate important information needed for academic planning within the department. Curriculum revision, proposals for new programs, staffing needs, and budget priorities should be supported by information identified through the self-study process. The Office of Planning, Evaluation & Institutional Research (OPEIR) works closely with academic Deans and Department Heads to coordinate the program review process on the UTC campus. OPEIR will support each department undergoing program review by providing guidance and information during the self-study.

Questions?

Each section within this packet includes useful information that will guide departments under review through the program review process. Please refer to this packet often to ensure you are meeting the necessary deadlines and including the essential information. Should you have any questions along the way, please contact your OPEIR program review liaison, **Cindy Williamson** (ext. 4288; Cynthia-I-Taylor@utc.edu). If she is unavailable and you need immediate assistance, please contact April Matthews (ext. 5684 or April-Matthews@utc.edu) or the Office of Planning, Evaluation & Institutional Research at ext. 4007.

Contacts:

Cindy Williamson	423-425-4288	Cynthia-I-Taylor@utc.edu
April Matthews	423-425-5684	April-Matthews@utc.edu

Overview of Activities

This section of the program review packet contains a timeline specifying when certain steps should be completed, followed by a more detailed explanation of each step.

Timeline

Step #	Description	Estimated Completion Dates
Step 1	Assign self-study responsibilities	September 10th
Step 2	Review data from OPEIR	September 10th
Step 3	Meet with OPEIR staff to discuss academic program review process	September 18th
Step 4	Submit nominees for external reviewers	October 6th
Step 5	Conduct self-study and prepare report	October and November
Step 6	Submit initial draft of self-study report	November 18th
Step 7	Submit final version of self-study report	December 3rd
Step 8	Schedule and make arrangements for external reviewer site visit	December 11th
Step 9	Conduct external reviewer site visit	February or March
Step 10	External reviewer submits completed Rubric and final review to Department Head and Director of Assessment, OPEIR	February or March
Step 11	Department develops a plan to address recommendations of reviewer and self-study	September 30th
Step 12	Implement plan to address recommendations of reviewer and self-study as a part of the ongoing institutional effectiveness process	Academic year(s) following the program review

Activity Details

STEP 1: Assign self-study responsibilities

A critical decision in ensuring the success of the self-study process is selecting self-study team members. The Department Head and Dean should select the self-study team, whose responsibilities will include conducting evaluation activities, analyzing data, and writing the self-study report. In some cases, a department may assign primary responsibility to one faculty member. In others, a department may assign its entire faculty to designated review responsibilities. This decision is best made by individual departments, considering faculty skills, interests, and workloads. Departments are encouraged to include students in the self-study process and may include them as members of a departmental team. OPEIR will work with faculty responsible for the self-study to provide data, assist with interpretation of guidelines, and offer staff support.

STEP 2: Review data from OPEIR

OPEIR with provide departments with a *Program Overview* document, which contains considerable information to assist in conducting and supporting the self-study. This information consists of data related to students, curriculum, faculty, diversity, and resources. It is the academic department's responsibility to review and verify the accuracy of all information included in the self-study.

STEP 3: Meet with OPEIR staff to discuss academic program review process

Those in the department who have been selected to be involved in the program review will have a meeting with the Director of Assessment and Outcomes Analyst from OPEIR. You will be contacted by OPEIR to schedule this meeting.

STEP 4: Submit nominees for external reviewers

Each program under review must have one external reviewer. The reviewer must be employed outside the State of Tennessee, must have current or prior experience at the level of Department Chair or higher, and should have prior experience relevant to the program review process. Their experiences should enable them to make judgments and recommendations about the quality of UTC programs compared to the "best practice' standards at comparable institutions (*see External Reviewer Selection Criteria).* After consultation with and approval from the Dean, the department submits at least three external reviewer nominees (along with information on their credentials) to OPEIR for qualification verification. Once qualifications have been verified, the department will submit the nominees to the Provost for approval. Please make sure that the reviewer is approved by the Dean and Provost before inviting the reviewer to campus.

STEP 5: Conduct self-study and prepare report

The self-study report is the basis for the entire program review process, so this document must be accurate, complete, and well written. It is important that the report address all the questions detailed in the *Self-Study Guidelines* unless they are clearly not applicable. It also is important that objective data be presented and cited in the report to justify conclusions and recommendations. Each section of

the report should conclude with an assessment of strengths and weaknesses and include recommendations for change, if needed. If the report is written by several faculty members, one person will need to integrate the individual sections into a composite report that is consistent in format, style, etc. It will be helpful to review the Program Review Rubric while writing the self-study to ensure that all of the items are addressed.

STEP 6: Submit initial draft of self-study report

The Department Head submits the initial draft to the college Dean and to OPEIR. The Dean and OPEIR will review the draft for completeness and for anticipation of questions/comments from external reviewers, and will then offer advice to the department regarding the report's completeness, accuracy, and style. After receiving input from the Dean and OPEIR, the department will prepare its final self-study draft. This draft should represent a consensus of the faculty, and agreement among the Department Head, Dean, and OPEIR.

STEP 7: Submit final version of self-study report

After completing the revision process, the Department Head should send a pdf of the final self-study, including appendices to OPEIR, the Provost and to the Dean of the Graduate School.

STEP 8: Schedule and make arrangements for external reviewer site visit

After the Dean and Provost approve the external reviewer, the department is ready to schedule and make arrangements for the site visit. External reviewers should plan to be on campus at least two full days. UTC will allocate a maximum of $2,200 for the site visit, which typically is used to cover travel, lodging, meal expenses, and an honorarium for the external reviewer.

The department is responsible for sending the external reviewer the self-study document, supporting materials, THEC Rubric, and guidelines for the external reviewer's report at least two weeks prior to the scheduled on-site visit. The department is also responsible for handling logistical plans/issues for the reviewer while on campus (transportation, parking, access to computer, etc.).

STEP 9: Distribution of materials

Two weeks prior to the scheduled on-site visit send the final draft of the self-study to all members participating in the review.

STEP 10: Conduct external reviewer site visit

During the site visit, the reviewer should be scheduled for interviews with the Department Head, the college Dean, the Provost, the Vice Provost Academic Affairs, the Dean of the Library, the Executive Director of OPEIR, and the Director of Assessment. Evaluators should also meet with departmental faculty, students, and alumni. The reviewer must have sufficient time to review records verifying information included in the self-study report. The exit interviews will be oral reports summarizing the reviewer's judgments regarding the department's compliance with THEC criteria and advice for the department's future directions.

STEP 11: External Reviewer submits completed Rubric and final review to Department Head and Director of Assessment of OPEIR

Before leaving campus, the external reviewer must (1) complete and submit the program review Rubric required by THEC, and (2) participate in exit interviews with department faculty, Academic Affairs administrators (Provost and Vice Provost), the Executive Director of OPEIR, and the Director of Assessment, OPEIR.

Within two weeks of the site visit, the external reviewer must complete a brief narrative report and submit the report to both the Department Head and OPEIR.

STEP 12: Department develops a plan to address recommendations of reviewer and self-study

After the narrative report is received, the department should review the self-study, the report and recommendations and develop a plan to monitor and address those recommendations over the next five years.

STEP 13: Implement plan to address recommendations of reviewer and self-study as a part of the ongoing institutional effectiveness process

The improvement plan can be incorporated as a part of the ongoing institutional effectiveness plans that are due from departments in September of every year. Departments should plan assessment strategies that will allow them to evaluate the recommended strategies on an ongoing basis using both direct and indirect data (grades, surveys, employer data, etc.).

Self-study Guidelines

The end product of the self-study process will be a program report that addresses, at minimum, the items in the THEC performance funding Rubric. This Rubric will be used by the external reviewer who is selected to review the program. Addressing each of the sections in the report ensures that departments cover all necessary topics and allows the reviewer to find pertinent program information more easily.

The following pages include:

1. The THEC Rubric that will be used by the external reviewer during his/her site visit to campus
2. Details on the structure and content of the program self-study report

Please consider the THEC Rubric and the self-study narrative guidelines while preparing your program's self-study document. Referencing these guidelines frequently will ensure that the report is comprehensive and will minimize any revisions that need to be made.

Reviewer Rubric

2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Graduate Programs

Institution:	
Program Title:	
CIP Code:	**Degree Designation:**

Instruction for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following *Program Review Rubric*. The *Program Review Rubric* lists 32 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points in to graduate programs. The four criteria noted with an asterisk are excluded from the point calculation but will be used by the institution in their overall assessment.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a *Self Study*. Supporting documents will be available for review 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 the program currently exhibits poor, fair, good or excellent in meeting the criterion. If a particular criterion is 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 rubric will be shared with the department, 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 *Program Review Rubric* will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

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

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s)

Name		**Name**	
Title		**Title**	
Institution		**Institution**	
Signature		**Signature**	
Date		**Date**	

Program Review Rubric
Graduate Programs

Directions: Please rate the quality of the academic program by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box to indicate whether the program currently exhibits poor, fair, good or excellent evidence of meeting the criterion.

1. Learning Outcomes		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1.1	Program and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.					
1.2	The program uses appropriate evidence to evaluate achievement of program and student learning outcomes.					
1.3	The program makes use of information from its evaluation of program and student learning outcomes and uses the results for continuous improvement.					
1.4	The program directly aligns with the institution's mission.					
2. Curriculum		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
2.1	The curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly and the results are used for curricular improvement.					
2.2	The program has developed a process to ensure courses are offered regularly and that students can make timely progress towards their degree.					
2.3	The program reflects progressively more advanced in academic content than its related undergraduate programs.					
2.4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program and student learning outcomes identified in 1.1.					
2.5	The curriculum is structured to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline.					
2.6	The curriculum strives to offer ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.					
2.7	Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure achievement of program outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.					
2.8	The program incorporates appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations that advance student learning into the curriculum.					

3. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
3.1	The program ensures a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.					
3.2	The program provides students with the opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					
3.3	The program provides adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication.					
3.4	The program provides adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.					
3.5	The program seeks to include diverse perspectives and experiences through curricular and extracurricular activities.					
3.6	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.					
4. Faculty		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
4.1	All faculty, full time and part-time, meet the high standards set by the program and expected SACSCOC guidelines for credentials.					
4.2	The faculty teaching loads are aligned with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.					
4.3*	The faculty strives to cultivate diversity with respect to gender, ethnicity, and academic background, as appropriate to the demographics of the discipline.					
4.4	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship and practice.					
4.5	The faculty is actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success.					
4.6	The program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					

5. Learning Resources		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
5.1*	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall institutional resources.					
5.2	The program has access to learning and information resources that are appropriate to support teaching and learning.					
5.3	The program provides adequate materials and support staff to encourage research and publication.					
6. Support		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
6.1*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.					
6.2*	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					
6.3	The program is responsive to local, state, regional, and national needs.					
6.4	The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.					
6.5	The program's procedures are regularly reviewed to ensure alignment to institutional policies and mission.					

**Criteria not scored as part of Quality Assurance Funding.*

Self-study Narrative Guidelines

Using the outline and recommended information/data (as detailed in the following pages), develop a concise but complete narrative describing your program relevant to the criteria that reviewers will use to evaluate your program (see *Reviewer Rubric*).

Preface/History

The report should present a **brief** summary of activities and identify factors that have significantly affected the program's mission during its recent history. This summary may include a review of major findings and recommendations of the previous review and the department, college, and/or university's response to them. It should include five-year (or longer, if appropriate) patterns in resource allocations and productivity indicators consistent with the program's mission. Changes in organizational structure, curriculum, goals, and direction should be highlighted.

Suggested information/data for the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes a preface/history that provides a context and framework for the external reviewer's understanding of the program. The following types of information can be helpful to reviewers:

- **Recent changes and developments in the program:** Describe your program's overall mission and discuss any changes that have been enacted or developments that have occurred since the previous self-study.

- **Trends:** Describe and discuss any noteworthy trends (as appropriate to your program). You may consider including information regarding trends in student performance on standardized exams, placement of students in occupational positions related to major field of study, student research activity, student satisfaction with UTC, enrollment growth and diversity, student retention, credit hour production, faculty scholarship, student enrichment activities.

- **Response to previous external review findings and recommendations:** Briefly outline the major findings and recommendations of the previous review and the department, college, and/or university's response to them.

Part 1: Learning Outcomes

1. Learning Outcomes – Criteria for Evaluation	
1.1	Program and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.
1.2	The program uses appropriate evidence to evaluate achievement of program and student learning outcomes.
1.3	The program makes use of information from its evaluation of program and student learning outcomes and uses the results for continuous improvement.
1.4	The program directly aligns with the institution's mission.

Suggested information/data for Part 1 of self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically addresses the evaluation criteria by describing the following components of your program.

- **Departmental/program goals/outcomes statements:** Include/discuss your program mission, vision, and goal statements. Describe how these statements clearly identify intended program and learning outcomes (criterion 1.1) and how they align with the institutional mission and vision (criterion 1.4).

- **Program outcomes goals/data:** Discuss and list program-specific SACSCOC outcomes goals/data. Describe how SACSCOC outcomes goals/data document the program's alignment with the evaluation criteria (criteria 1.1, 1.2, 1.3). Include curriculum maps as applicable to illustrate where the program outcomes are taught and assessed.

- **Course syllabi:** Describe, discuss, and append copies of sample course syllabi. If applicable, describe how syllabi clearly identify intended program and learning outcomes (criterion 1.1) and specify the use of appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement of program outcomes (criterion 1.2).

- **Student performance on licensure/certification exams:** If applicable, discuss student performance on licensure/certification exams. As appropriate, describe how the results of performance on licensure/certification exams have been utilized as indicators to evaluate achievement of program outcomes (criterion 1.2) and/or make use of information to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion 1.3).

- **Results of departmental/institutional surveys:** Describe, discuss, and, if appropriate, append results of departmental/institutional surveys relevant to your program. As appropriate, describe how the surveys use appropriate indicators to evaluate achievement of program outcomes (criterion 1.2) and how the program made use of survey information to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion 1.3).

- **Placement of students in occupations related to major field of study:** Discuss the program's success with placing students in occupations related to the major field of study. As appropriate, describe how the rate of student placement is used as an indicator to evaluate the achievement of program outcomes (criterion 1.2) and how the program makes use of job placement data to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion 1.3).

- **Employer satisfaction with academic program:** If applicable, discuss information about the extent to which the employers of graduates of your program are satisfied with the preparation the graduates from your program. As appropriate, describe how the program makes use of employer surveys to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion 1.3).

- **Include additional information as appropriate.**

Part 2: Curriculum

2. Curriculum – Criteria for Evaluation	
2.1	The curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly and the results are used for curricular improvement.
2.2	The program has developed a process to ensure courses are offered regularly and that students can make timely progress towards their degree.
2.3	The program reflects progressively more advanced in academic content than its related undergraduate programs.
2.4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program and student learning outcomes identified in 1.1.
2.5	The curriculum is structured to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline.
2.6	The curriculum strives to offer ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.
2.7	Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure achievement of program outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.
2.8	The program incorporates appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations that advance student learning into the curriculum.

Suggested information/data for Part 2 of self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically addresses the evaluation criteria by describing the following components of your program.

- **Departmental/Program curriculum process:** Describe the process by which the program curriculum is reviewed, revised, and implemented (criterion 2.1). What data are collected and reviewed? How are those data used to inform curriculum changes/revisions? Describe the schedule of course offerings to ensure student completion and success (criterion 2.2). Discuss the frequency/regularity of curricular evaluation activities and discuss how necessary curricular changes are enacted. You may wish to describe and discuss any curriculum evaluation/revision activities that have been undertaken since the previous program review.

- **Course syllabi:** Describe, discuss, and/or refer readers to the discussion of major program syllabi included in Part 1. In this section, clearly describe how the syllabi document that the curriculum is appropriate to the level and purpose of a graduate program (criterion 2.3); the curriculum includes a required core of appropriate courses in the discipline (criterion 2.4); curricular content reflects current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline (criterion 2.5); the curriculum offers students opportunities for appropriate research strategies, professional practices, etc. (criterion 2.6); and the curricular pedagogy and technology used (criterion 2.8).

- **SACSCOC outcomes data:** Discuss SACSCOC outcomes data and, as appropriate, identify how your program's SACSCOC outcomes show that your project meets specific evaluation criteria (criterion 2.4).

- **Curriculum review/revision information:** Discuss any curriculum review/revision activities that have been undertaken. Discuss how the curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly (criterion 2.1) and the extent to which any other aspects of the curriculum review/revision document the fulfillment of evaluation criteria.

- **Catalog information:** Describe, discuss, and append catalog information describing the program. Specifically identify how the catalog documents the fulfillment of evaluation criteria. Relevant criteria may include 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.8.

- **Information regarding current approaches/issues in the discipline:** If appropriate, describe and discuss information regarding current approaches/issues in the discipline such as changes to the certification/licensure requirements, identified best practices, changes in the field that require curricular revisions, etc. Specifically, identify how the program's curricular content reflects the current standards, practices, and issues that you have described (criterion 2.6) and reference other evaluation criteria that are relevant.

- **Curricular research opportunities:** Discuss and describe how the curriculum incorporates appropriate research strategies and provides opportunities for students to participate in research (criteria 2.5 and 2.8). This discussion may be enhanced by information such as the number/type/quality of research projects completed by majors in your program, research grants applied for/received by majors in your program, conference presentations by majors in your program, faculty/student research collaboration or joint student-faculty publications.

- **Distance education programming (if appropriate):** Discuss and describe the program's use of distance education technologies (off-campus, online, or hybrid), specifying whether the program is offered entirely through distance technology. If the program is offered entirely through distance education technologies, provide evidence that the program is evaluated regularly to assure that student outcomes are at least equivalent to on-campus programs (criterion 2.7).

- **Additional information as appropriate:** You may need or want to include some additional information to emphasize how your program meets the evaluation criteria. You may consider including the following kinds of information: Results of departmental/institutional surveys (related criteria depends on the nature of the survey – an employer survey may support criteria 2.1, 2.5, and 2.6; a student survey may support criteria 2.8) or the placement of students in occupations related to major field of study (may relate to criteria 2.5, 2.6, etc.).

Part 3: Student Experience

3. Student Experience – Criterion for Evaluation	
3.1	The program ensures a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.
3.2	The program provides students with the opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.
3.3	The program provides adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication.
3.4	The program provides adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.
3.5	The program seeks to include diverse perspectives and experiences through curricular and extracurricular activities.
3.6	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.

Suggested Information/data for Part 3 of the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes the following kinds of information.

- **Student enrollment:** Describe the student enrollment capacity and how this ensures student peer groups and a critical mass (criterion 3.1).

- **Student evaluation:** Describe how students provide feedback on the program, curriculum, faculty and other opportunities (criterion 3.2). Items to include might be a departmental perspective of data from student rating of faculty and other focus group data on the quality of the faculty and the curricula.

- **Student enrichment opportunities:** Discuss and describe student enrichment opportunities available to students in the program. Include information about lecture series, student organizations, etc., and provide evidence that the enrichment opportunities available to students are adequate to promote a scholarly environment (criterion 3.3). You may consider including information regarding student involvement in research grant activity, student publications/presentations at professional conferences (and at the annual Research Day), and other faculty/student collaborations as appropriate.

- **Student professional development opportunities:** Discuss and describe student professional development opportunities available to program students (criterion 3.4). Include information about the extent to which the program encourages student membership in professional associations, supports student participation in conferences and workshops, and promotes opportunities for student publication. Address how the program promotes diverse perspectives and experiences (criterion 3.5).

- **Academic support services:** Describe the academic support services available to students and data on their use and effectiveness of those support services (criterion 3.6).

Part 4: Faculty

4. Faculty – Criterion for Evaluation	
4.1	All faculty, full-time and part-time, meet the high standards set by the program and expected SACSCOC guidelines for credentials.
4.2	The faculty teaching loads are aligned with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.
4.3	The faculty strives to cultivate diversity with respect to gender, ethnicity, and academic background, as appropriate to the demographics of the discipline.
4.4	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship and practice.
4.5	The faculty is actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success.
4.6	The program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

Suggested Information/data for Part 4 of the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes the following kinds of information.

- **Faculty credentials:** Describe the academic backgrounds of program faculty, specifying the extent to which faculty hold terminal degrees in the appropriate discipline (criterion 4.1). Discuss and describe how faculty academic credentials correspond to the concentrations and courses in which they teach, ensuring that faculty specialties correspond to program needs (criterion 4.1). You may wish to include information here regarding the extent to which the faculty mix is diverse with respect to gender and ethnicity as appropriate to the demographics of the discipline (criterion 4.3). Discuss the quality of teaching in the program (including an analysis of recent teaching evaluations).

- **Faculty workload:** Describe the institutional and/or departmental workload model to demonstrate how theses and dissertations are considered as a part of that workload (criterion 4.2). Provide a sample of workloads from the past 3-5 years as supporting documentation.

- **Faculty scholarly activity:** Describe and discuss scholarly productivity among faculty. Provide information on recent scholarly and professional activities for each full-time faculty member including publications, conference presentations, professional awards, internal/external grants, offices in professional organizations, juried exhibitions, sabbatical activities, service on scholarly journal and/or grant proposal review panels, etc. Provide evidence that faculty scholarly activity is sufficient to enable faculty to serve as effective mentors for graduate students (criterion 4.4). To address this criterion and provide evidence of effective mentoring, you may consider including or referencing information regarding any student involvement in grants and research projects, student publications/presentations at professional conferences, and other faculty/student collaborations as appropriate.

- **Faculty experience:** Describe and discuss the practical, professional, and academic experience held by program faculty. Include information on faculty consulting, professional or industry experience, faculty service on community boards/commissions, sabbatical activities, and academic experience. Provide evidence that faculty practical, professional, and academic experience is sufficient to enable faculty to serve as effective mentors for graduate students (criterion 4.4). To address this criterion

and provide evidence of effective mentoring, you may consider including or referencing information regarding student engagement in consulting or other applied or scholarly activities, student employment/engagement on grant-funded scholarly or applied activities, faculty experience and support in helping students enroll in advanced training (e.g., Ph.D. programs), as appropriate.

- **Faculty professional development opportunities:** Describe and discuss the extent to which faculty members have access to regular opportunities to engage in professional development including travel and participation in professional organizations, workshops, and other learning activities (criterion 4.4). Include information about the opportunities that exist and describe how program faculty have utilized these opportunities to enhance instruction, improve student learning and engage in scholarly activities. You may wish to include information about any mentoring or special faculty development provided to new or contingent faculty and identify any professional development needs that exist in the program.

- **Faculty service:** Describe faculty workloads that include teaching, research/scholarship and service and present information to summarize faculty course assignments, teaching load profiles, and student credit hour production. Are faculty workloads reasonable and equitable? How are courses balanced between regular and adjunct faculty (criteria 4.4 and 4.6)? Describe how faculty are included in the planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure student success (criterion 4.5).

- **Overall faculty quality:** Overall, are the faculty and administration satisfied with the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service in the program? What improvements/enhancements are needed? Describe how faculty are evaluated on teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service. Include information for how these evaluation methods are used to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service (criterion 4.6).

- **Faculty evaluation system:** Discuss the processes and procedures in place in your program to evaluate faculty and improve teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service (criterion 4.6). Specifically, discuss how the EDO process is used to evaluate faculty and promote continuous improvement. You may also want to include information regarding recent teaching evaluations and student/alumni/employer surveys and describe how results are used to enhance the quality of instruction in the program.

Part 5: Learning Resources

5. Learning Resources – Criterion for Evaluation	
5.1	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall institutional resources.
5.2	The program has access to learning and information resources that are appropriate to support teaching and learning.
5.3	The program provides adequate materials and support staff to encourage research and publication.

Suggested information/data for Part 5 of the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes the following kinds of information.

- **Equipment and facilities:** Describe how the program assesses program equipment and facilities and how it plans for replacement and updates. Include how funds are requested and allotted (criterion 5.1) and information regarding UTC and program-specific student computer labs, program faculty/staff computer inventory, faculty access to expertise from the Walker Center for Teaching & Learning or campus IT staff.

- **Library and learning resources support:** Discuss the program's level of library support and how those are appropriate to support teaching and learning (criterion 5.2). Include information such as the annual library budget for books/journals, number of current library subscriptions, and departmental strategies to maximize library resources to enhance learning and scholarship. If library support is deemed inadequate, discuss the impact upon the department and its ability to achieve its goals. If possible, discuss alternative ways of meeting resource needs. As appropriate, you may wish to include information regarding sources of support available from gift funds and the degree to which program faculty seek support from these and other internal sources of support or the program's activity in seeking support from external sources. Summarize proposals and grants from external agencies and foundations.

- **Materials and support staffing:** Describe and discuss the availability of materials and support staff available to faculty and students to support the program, research and publication. Assess the extent to which these materials and administrative support is adequate to encourage research and publication in the program (criterion 5.3). Include information about the faculty/support staff ratio and material resources (supplies, equipment, software, etc.) available in the program. Specify any noteworthy achievements or inadequacies. Describe or refer to other sections of the self-study document that describe scholarly output and publication among faculty and students. As appropriate, discuss the program's strategies to maximize those resources that are available in order to promote research and publication. If any departmental resources are deemed inadequate, discuss the impact upon the program's ability to achieve its goals. If possible, discuss alternative ways of meeting resource needs.

Part 6: Support

6. Support – Criteria for Evaluation	
6.1	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.
6.2	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.
6.3	The program is responsive to local, state, regional, and national needs.
6.4	The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.
6.5	The program's procedures are regularly reviewed to ensure alignment to institutional policies and mission.

Suggested Information/data for Part 6 of the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes the following kinds of information.

- **Operating budget:** Describe, discuss, and append a copy of the program's operating budget. Specify the extent to which the operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program (criterion 6.1). You may want to show how the budget has changed over the past five years in response to the needs of the program.

- **Enrollment & graduation rates:** Describe, discuss, and append appropriate documentation relevant to enrollment, graduation, and retention in your program (criterion 6.2). Specifically discuss the extent to which the program's history of enrollment and graduation rates are sufficient to sustain a high-quality, cost-effective program. Include information on how this data is collected and maintained (criterion 6.4), especially related to placement.

- **Responsiveness:** Demonstrate and document ways in which the program has responded to local, state, regional and national needs. These might include curricular changes/updates, professional development programming, etc. (criterion 6.3).

- **Alignment with institutional policies:** Document and describe how departmental and program procedures are reviewed to ensure consistency with institutional policies (criterion 6.5).

Additional Information

The information contained in this section includes (1) the criteria for selecting an external reviewer and (2) a breakdown of reimbursable costs for the site visit.

External Reviewer Selection Criteria

External reviewers must meet the following requirements:

- Hold a terminal degree appropriate to the program under review.
- Have a record of outstanding scholarship and/or professional experience appropriate to the program under review.
- Is recognized as an active member of scholarly and/or professional societies appropriate to the program under review.
- Is currently employed in a recognized university or education-related organization *outside the State of Tennessee.*
- Has current or prior experience as the level of Department Chair or higher at a peer or aspirational peer institution to UTC.
- Has prior experience relevant to the accreditation and/or a program review process.
- Has no conflicts of interest (e.g., former employee, relative of current faculty member, etc.) related to the program under review.

Reimbursable Costs for Site Visit

Your department is responsible for processing/handling all program review related expenses, including payment to the external reviewer for the honorarium and travel expenses. All state travel rates must be utilized for external reviewer travel. Following the site visit, OPEIR will facilitate a budget transfer to your department for up to $2,200 to help you pay for program review expenses.

Once the program review is complete, complete a transfer voucher that outlines all reimbursable expenses (see below). Send the transfer voucher to the Director of Assessment (OPEIR) and attach copies of receipts for all expenses for which you are requesting reimbursement.

Below is an **approximate** breakdown of how you will likely spend these program review funds. If you have special circumstances and need additional funds (e.g., your reviewer is staying longer than two days), please let OPEIR know before you confirm the visit. Otherwise, any funds expended in excess of the $2,200 transferred will be the responsibility of your department. If you wish to pay your reviewer more than the suggested honorarium and it will take you above the $2,200 authorized amount, your department will be responsible for the additional funds.

Item	Details	Amount
Honorarium	Intended for 2 day/2 night review *Note: do not pay honorarium until the evaluator provides narrative report	**Suggested $1000**
Travel Costs	For external reviewer – includes mileage (State mileage rates will apply [currently .47/mile, see http://treasurer.tennessee.edu/travel/reimbursement-rates.htm], airfare, parking, etc.) *Note: For airfare over $500, contact OPEIR for approval.	**$500**
Hotel Expenses	For 2 nights at $107 per night *Suggested lodging: Mayor's Mansion, Read House or other local hotel honoring state rate	**$214**
Meals	Dinners: $200 ($20/person X 5 people X 2 dinners) Lunches: $100 ($10/person X 5 people X 2 lunches) Breakfast: $20 (one breakfast – OPEIR will cover orientation breakfast)	**$320**
Other	Photocopying/Misc.	**$166**

Note: If your department has two programs under review and you would like to use two separate external reviewers, please discuss with OPEIR prior to arranging travel, etc. If you are approved to use two reviewers, your department will be reimbursed accordingly.

Dean and Provost Responsibilities

Responsibilities of the Dean:

1. The Dean should work with the Department Head to select the self-study team. Team members will write and compile the self-study report and participate in the site visit.
2. Once the Department Head has identified an external reviewer, the Dean must give initial approval and send that to the Provost, who gives final approval.
3. The Dean (and OPEIR) will review the draft of the self-study report and suggest any changes that could be made to enhance the clarity, professionalism, and appearance of the document.
4. During the external reviewer site visit, the Dean will meet one-on-one with the reviewer.
5. The Dean is expected to attend the external reviewer exit interview at the conclusion of the reviewer's site visit.

Responsibilities of the Provost:

1. Once the Department Head has identified an external reviewer and the Dean has approved the selection, the Provost must give final approval. This approval must be communicated to the Department Head, the Dean, the Executive Director of OPEIR, and the Director of Assessment.
2. After the self-study report has been revised based on suggestions from the Dean and OPEIR, the Provost should review the final version of the report before it is sent to the external reviewer.
3. During the external reviewer site visit, the Provost will meet one-on-one with the reviewer.
4. The Provost is expected to attend the external reviewer exit interview at the conclusion of the reviewer's site visit.

Program Information Provided to the Departments by OPEIR

Student Information

- Enrollment Trends
- Degrees Awarded
- Student Retention Rates
- Employment and Placement

Curriculum Information

- Course Enrollment (Past Two Years)

Faculty Information

- Course Learning Evaluation Results
- Internal Support
  - SEARCH Awards
  - Faculty Development and Research Grants and Summer Fellowships
  - Faculty Sabbaticals
  - High Impact Practice Awards
  - QEP Faculty Awards
- External Grants
- Student Credit Hour Production per FTE Faculty (Adjuncts not Included)
- Student Credit Hour Production per FTE Faculty (Adjuncts Included)

Diversity

- Faculty: Gender and Ethnicity
- Student Majors: Gender and Ethnicity

Resources

- Library Holdings of Materials Relevant to Program (provided through a link on the Library web pages)
- Journal List (provided by the Library)
- Expenditures per Full-Time Faculty Member
- Expenditures per Student Major
- Expenditures per Student Credit Hour Production

Document Templates

This section includes a sample letter of agreement for the external reviewer, and a sample itinerary for the site visit. Please update and change as needed.

Sample Letter of Agreement for Reviewer

Dear [Name],

I am pleased that you have agreed to conduct an external review of our [name program] program [enter date]. As we begin to plan the review process, I wanted to outline your responsibilities before, during, and after the site visit, as well as the compensation you will receive for your services.

Responsibilities:

- Review self-study report and other review materials prior to site visit (these materials will be sent at least two weeks before your scheduled visit).
- Participate in a two-day site visit at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) where you will meet with faculty, students, alumni, and upper level administrators.
- Complete the THEC academic program review Rubric (required by the state of Tennessee) on the **last day** of the site visit.
- Complete a narrative report of your findings **within two weeks** of your site visit (use guidelines provided)

Compensation for Review:

You will receive a $1000 honorarium for your services, and we will also reimburse you for all travel costs (hotel, mileage, parking, airfare, meals, etc.) for the two-day, two-night visit. Some additional details to note are listed below.

- Our department can assist you with making hotel reservations in the area to ensure that you will be getting the State rate.
- If you do plan to fly, please be sure to get approval from our department if the airfare will cost over $500.
- You will be paid your $1000 honorarium after our department has received the narrative report of your findings
- Please save all receipts and turn them into our secretary before you leave town so we can reimburse you for your expenses

If you have any questions about the external review process, please do not hesitate to contact me at [insert contact info].

If you agree with the terms described in this letter, please fill in the following lines and fax [insert fax number] or scan and email [insert email address] the completed document at your earliest convenience.

_____	_____	_____
Name (please print)	Signature	Date

Thank you,

[Department Head name]

Sample Site Visit Itinerary

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
[Department/Program Name]
Academic Program Review
[Date]
Agenda
[Reviewer Name] – [Reviewer's Institution]

Evening of Arrival

6:30 – 8:00 pm	Dinner with Alumni and Department Head and/or Dean

Day 1: [Insert date]

8:00 – 8:50 am	Breakfast & Orientation at [Insert Hotel] – Department Head, reviewers, Executive Director of OPEIR, Director of Assessment, OPEIR
9:00 – 9:40 am	Meeting with Provost
10:00 – 10:40 am	Meeting with Dean of the College
10:45 – 11:30 am	Meetings with Department Head
11:30 am – 12:00 pm	Meeting with faculty members (individually, collectively, or in a small group(s) as desired by the department)
12:15 – 1:30 pm	Lunch with small group of faculty
1:40 – 2:00 pm	Break
2:00 – 2:30 pm	Meeting with faculty (continued) and/or staff
2:30 – 2:50 pm	Meeting with students
3:00 – 3:50 pm	Meeting with Dean of the Library
4:00 – 4:30 pm	Meeting with other administrators (e.g., Walker Center for Teaching & Learning) as deemed necessary
5:30 – 6:10 pm	Meeting with students and/or attend a class
6:30 – 8:00 pm	Dinner with Department Head and/or Dean, faculty, and community representatives (e.g., major employers, industry representatives, etc.)

Day 2: [Insert date]

8:00 – 8:50 am	Breakfast at [Insert Hotel] – Department Head, reviewers, other faculty
9:00 – 9:40 am	Meeting with the Dean of the Graduate School
9:45 – 11:45 am	Review documents (files, data, etc.) and prepare draft report
12:00 – 1:15 pm	Lunch with small group of department faculty
1:30 – 2:50 pm	Email the THEC Rubric to OPEIR *prior to* exit conference anytime within this timeframe; this is not a meeting and will not take more than 5 minutes
3:00 – 4:00 pm	Exit Conference – Provost, Vice Provost, Dean, Department Head, reviewers, Executive Director of OPEIR, Director of Assessment

Please make sure to send a copy of the final agenda to all of the people involved in the program review visit.