

Academic Audit Onsite Evaluation Checklist

Institution: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Program: MS Health and Human Performance, Physical Activity and health

CIP Code:

Degree Level: Certificate Associate Baccalaureate Master's Doctoral

Instructions for Audit Chairs and Teams

Part I: Academic Audit Visiting Team Report -- Record of Commendations, Affirmations, and Recommendations

This form must be completed by each academic auditor team *prior to concluding the visit*. The original will be forwarded to TBR but a copy must be left with the department prior to departure. All observations included on this form should be represented as commendations, affirmations, or recommendations. Please be concise in your descriptions as you will have opportunity to expand upon your justification for each item in your written report due to TBR by May 13, 2016.

Part II: Academic Audit Rubric (only for use if program is being reviewed for Quality Assurance Funding purposes)

This form is only to be completed if the program review is serving as the Quality Assurance funding review. Using the Academic Audit Rubric complete the elements on the evaluation results checklist. This exercise must be completed and signed by the team prior to the Exit Session. The original will be forwarded to TBR, but a copy must be left with the department prior to departure.

Part III: Narrative Evaluation and Written Report

The academic auditor team will use their evaluations indicated on the Audit Visiting Team Report and Academic Audit Rubric (if used for Quality Assurance Funding purposes) as the basis of a written report. The academic auditor team's findings derived from the self-study report and on-site visit will be included in this narrative report of the team's conclusions. This written report (limited to 10 pages) is the final responsibility of the academic auditor team. This report is due to TBR on or before May 13, 2016.

The Audit Evaluation will become part of the record of the academic program review and will be shared with the academic department/unit, the college, and the central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Each department/campus will be provided opportunity to respond and comment on the written report.

Audit Chair's name, title, and institution: Norma Hogan, Professor Emerita, ETSU

Audit Chair's signature: N. Hogan **Date** April 5, 2016

Names, titles, institutions, and signatures of other Audit Team members:

Dominic Tharpe, Men's Basketball Coach, Motlow State Community College Bradford Strand, Professor and Program Coordinator, Health Education & Physical Education, North Dakota State University

N. Dominic Tharpe

Bradford Strand, Professor and Program Coordinator, Health Education & Physical Education, North Dakota State University

Brad Strand

Academic Audit Visiting Team Report

Record of Commendations, Affirmations, and Recommendations

This form must be completed by each audit review team prior to concluding the visit. All observations included on this form should be represented as commendations, affirmations, or recommendations. Please be concise in your descriptions as you will have opportunity to expand upon your justification for each item in your written report due to TBR by May 13, 2016.

This document should serve as the outline of information to be disclosed during the exit session with the department. The original signed copy is to be left with the campus academic audit coordinator or with the program's leader prior to leaving campus. A copy should be forwarded to TBR as part of the final Academic Auditor Team's final, written report.

Total Number of Commendations 4

Commendation #1 – The Academic Audit Team commends the development of the MS in Physical Activity and Health and the planning to transition to a Masters of Public Health.

Commendation #2 – The Academic Audit Team commends the hiring of new faculty to support the MS: PAH.

Commendation #3 – The Academic Audit Team commends the incorporation of practical, hands-on research and research-related experiences in the MS: PAH

Commendation #4 – The Academic Audit Team commends providing increasing numbers of students with opportunities to present research and participate in professional conferences.

.....

Total Number of Affirmations 2

Affirmation #1 – The Academic Audit Team affirms the more rigorous and more individualized nature of the graduate program, relative to undergraduate studies.

Affirmation #2 – The Academic Audit Team affirms that the graduate faculty overall displays the appropriate level of scholarly productivity and professional involvement to support a masters-level program.

Total Number of Recommendations 3

Recommendation #1 – The Academic Audit Team recommends that faculty in the MS: PAH program develop and implement a more formal process for identifying a comprehensive set of student learning outcomes (SLO's), communicating SLO's to students, assessing SLO's, and using assessment data for program improvement; where possible, faculty should use appropriate national professional standards to inform their identified SLO's.

Recommendation #2 – The Academic Audit Team recommends that faculty in the MS: PAH program clarify the relationship between student career goals and the desirability of completing either a thesis or a research project.

Recommendation #3 – The Academic Audit Team recommends that faculty and administration continue to monitor this new program and evaluate its future as it either transitions into the MPH or continues as it is.

2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Academic Audit: Graduate Programs



Institution: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		
Program Title: Health and Human Performance MS: Physical Activity & Health		
CIP Code:		
Academic Audit Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> First Academic Audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Academic Audit

Instruction for Academic Audit Team

In accordance with the 2015-20 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 graduate program appear in the following *Academic Audit Rubric*. The *Academic Audit Rubric* lists 38 criteria grouped into eight standards. Criteria in standards 1-7 will be used to assess standards and distribute points to graduate programs utilizing the Academic Audit for the first time. Programs undergoing a follow-up Academic Audit, criteria 8 will also be used to assess standards and distribute points. The three 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 an Academic Audit Team Leader, 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 criterion is not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed in the program. If a particular criterion is inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked NA.

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 Academic Audit Team, the Academic Audit 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 institution's budget.

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Audit Team Leaders

<p>Name <u>Norma Hogan</u></p> <p>Title <u>Professor Emerita</u></p> <p>Institution <u>East Tennessee State University</u></p> <p>Signature <u></u></p> <p>Date <u>April 3, 2016</u></p>	<p>Name <u></u></p> <p>Title _____</p> <p>Institution _____</p> <p>Signature <u></u></p> <p>Date _____</p>
---	---

Academic Audit Rubric Graduate Programs

Directions: Please rate the quality of the academic program by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box to indicate whether the criterion is not applicable (N/A), not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed.

1. Learning Outcomes		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
1.1	The faculty has identified program learning outcomes that are current, measurable and based upon appropriate processes and evidence regarding the requirements of the discipline.			X		
1.2	The faculty has identified student learning outcomes in its core coursework that are clear, measurable and based on an appropriate process to identify what students need to master in each course.			X		
1.3	The faculty has an appropriate process for evaluating program and course-level learning outcomes on a regular basis taking into account best practices, stakeholder feedback and appropriate benchmarks in the field.			X		
2. Curriculum		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
2.1	The faculty collaborates regularly and effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.				X	
2.2	The faculty regularly analyzes the content and sequencing of courses as applicable in terms of achieving program learning outcomes.				X	
2.3	The faculty regularly reviews the curriculum based on appropriate evidence including comparison with best practices where appropriate.				X	
3. Teaching and Learning		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
3.1	The faculty regularly and effectively collaborates in designing, developing and delivering teaching methods that improve student learning throughout the program.				X	
3.2	The faculty promotes the effective use of instructional materials and teaching tools, including technology as appropriate, for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.				X	
3.3	The program regularly evaluates the effectiveness of teaching methods and the appropriateness of instructional materials.				X	
3.4	The faculty analyze evaluation results on a regular basis and modify teaching methods to improve student learning.				X	
3.5	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances its teaching, scholarship and practice.					X

3.6	The program monitors student persistence and success in its courses and program and uses that data to inform improvements in the program and to optimize student success.				X	
3.7	The program's faculty and students actively develop, promote and contribute to a scholarly community that engages a network of peers both from within and outside of the institution.					X
3.8	Faculty roles and responsibilities are regularly assessed and appropriately distributed across the department to support student success.				X	
3.9	The program ensures that all students are adequately oriented, advised, mentored and socialized within the discipline and the larger graduate community.				X	
4. Student Learning Assessment		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
4.1	The faculty uses indicators of student learning success that are aligned with program and student learning outcomes.			X		
4.2	The faculty assesses student learning at multiple points throughout the program using a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.				X	
4.3	The program regularly implements continuous quality improvements based upon the results of its student learning assessments.			X		
4.4	The program requires a culminating experience that demonstrates mastery of student learning outcomes through appropriate communication and ability to apply knowledge.				X	
4.5	The program regularly provides students with opportunities to participate in activities and/or seminars specific to the discipline outside of the classroom.				X	
4.6	Data on current students and follow-up data on graduating students, including placement data, are regularly and systematically collected and utilized for program improvement.			X		
5. Research Environment		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
5.1	The program demonstrates a commitment to matching or exceeding peer institutions in research activities.			X		
5.2	The faculty effectively communicates the program's research environment, values, and priorities to current and prospective students and other audiences.				X	
5.3	The program details departmental processes and procedures that reinforce faculty research activities and program competitiveness.				X	
5.4	The program engages graduate students in inquiry and contemporary research in collaboration with the faculty.				X	

5.5	The program strives for sponsored research funding at comparable levels with other departments within the institution and across peer institutions.				X	
5.6	The program ensures faculty are consistently informed of external funding opportunities as well as the availability of assistance in areas such as proposal writing and project management.				X	
5.7	The program demonstrates sufficient depth and breadth in research expertise to enable competitiveness in the external funding arena.				X	
5.8	The program ensures that external research programs both contribute to its educational program, and align with the missions of the department, college, and university.				X	
6. Support		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
6.1*	The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.				X	
6.2*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program				X	
6.3*	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.			X		
7. Academic Audit Process		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
7.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.				X	
7.2	The Academic Audit process (Self Study and site visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes.				X	
7.3	The Academic Audit process resulted in a thorough description of program strengths and program weaknesses as well as a prioritized list of initiatives for improvement.				X	
7.4	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from appropriate stakeholder groups.			X		
8. Follow-up of Previous Audit		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
8.1	There is documented evidence that the program has implemented the plans for its initiatives for improvement cited by the faculty in the previous self-study report including any changes to those initiatives for improvement.	X				
8.2	There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Auditor Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.	X				

* Criteria not scored as part of Quality Assurance Funding.