THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE CHATTANOOGA

2020-2025

Academic Program Review

External Reviewer On-Site Visit Packet

(Undergraduate Programs)

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

Introduction

Thank you for your willingness to conduct an external program review for the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC). Your commitment to the process (time, input, feedback, etc.) is much appreciated.

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

As an external reviewer, you will receive a copy of the program's self-study for review at least two weeks before your scheduled visit. Campus site visits generally span two days. During the site visit, you will have the opportunity to meet with faculty members, students, and key administrators at the university to assess various aspects of the program under review. Before leaving campus, you will be asked to complete the THEC Rubric (included in this document), and within two weeks of the visit, asked to complete and submit a narrative report.

This packet contains three documents.

- Letter of Agreement ..... Page 3
- THEC Undergraduate Rubric ..... Page 4
- Guidelines for Narrative Report ..... Page 7

The Letter of Agreement explains your responsibilities as an external reviewer and the compensation you will receive. Please sign and return this document to [Department Head Name]. The other two documents are for your use during and after the site visit.

If you have any questions, please contact [Department Head Name], the Department head of [Program Name] at [phone and/or email address]. We look forward to working with you!

[Insert Letter of Agreement from Academic Program Review Packet]

Reviewer Rubric

2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Baccalaureate Programs

Institution: The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Program Title:
CIP Code:

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 baccalaureate 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 30 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points in to baccalaureate 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
Baccalaureate 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 are reviewed regularly and 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 incorporates appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations that enhance student learning into the curriculum.					
2.4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program and student learning outcomes identified in 1.1.					
2.5	The curricular content of the program reflects current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline.					
2.6	The curriculum fosters analytical and critical thinking and problem-solving.					
2.7	The design of degree program specific courses provides students with a solid foundation.					
2.8	The curriculum reflects a progressive challenge to students and that depth and rigor effectively prepares students for careers or advanced study.					
2.9	The curriculum encourages the development of and the presentation of results and ideas effectively and clearly in both written and oral discourse.					
2.10	The curriculum exposes students to discipline-specific research strategies from the program area.					

3. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
3.1	The program provides students with opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					
3.2	The program ensures students are exposed to professional and career opportunities appropriate to the field.					
3.3	The program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.					
3.4	The program seeks to include diverse perspectives and experiences through curricular and extracurricular activities.					
3.5	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.					
4. Faculty (Full-time and Part-time)		**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 are adequate in number to meet the needs of the program with appropriate teaching loads.					
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 program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					
4.5	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship and practice.					
4.6	The faculty is actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success.					
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.					

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.					

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

Guidelines for Narrative Report

PART 1 – Learning Outcomes

How would you rank this program with similar ones in the state, region, and nation?

Are the intended program and learning outcomes clearly identified?

- Has the department specified program mission, vision, and goal statements? Do these statements clearly identify intended program and student learning outcomes? Are they appropriate for the program level (undergraduate) and for UTC?
- What goals should the department establish regarding its curriculum? In particular, what advice should be offered to the department developing goals regarding the following aspects.
    - Student performance on standardized exams
    - Student opportunities for research/involvement in faculty research
    - Student opportunities for practical/field experiences
    - Graduates' admittance to/performance in graduate schools
    - Student placement in occupational positions related to major field of study
- What goals should the department establish regarding its teaching? Faculty qualifications? Faculty development?

What criteria does the department use to evaluate sufficient achievement of intended program outcomes? Are the criteria appropriate for such evaluation and/or for the program?

Does the department make use of evaluation information and/or information obtained from student, alumni, and employer surveys and/or data from institutional research to strengthen and improve the program?

PART 2 – Curriculum

Is the current curriculum appropriate to the level and purpose of the program? Is it adequate to enable students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes needed for graduates of the program? Does it reflect the current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline?

Does the department regularly review and revise curriculum content and organization to ensure that it is appropriate and that it prepares students to meet the specified learning outcomes? Will the department need to update the curriculum and/or develop new or alternative offerings in the near future?

Is the curriculum content appropriate for UTC? Are the core and advanced courses approximately balanced? Does the overall curriculum ensure the development of appropriate skills in the following areas: general education, critical thinking skills, research strategies and skills, written and oral

communications, and computer and technology-related skills (in general and specific to the discipline)?

Are appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations included that enhance student learning? Are the department's instructional practices consistent with the standards of the discipline?

- Do the instructional practices provide adequate opportunities for student interactions with one another, faculty, and professionals?
- Does the department make adequate efforts to include students in the life of the program (e.g., seeking student advice in reviewing the curriculum/course schedules/teaching methods, etc.)?

Do students have adequate opportunities to participate in research, practica/field experiences/internships, or other experiences that allow them to apply learning outside the classroom and/or expose students to professional and career opportunities appropriate to the discipline?

Does the department clearly outline program requirements and offer courses regularly to ensure timely completion of the program?

PART 3 – Student Experience

Does the program and curricula provide students with the opportunities to evaluate the curriculum and the faculty? What procedures are in place to ensure and document that the department provides students with regular opportunities to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching? How well is this information used to improve the program?

Do students have adequate opportunities to participate in professional and career opportunities appropriate to the discipline and to opportunities to apply what they have learned outside of the classroom?

What curricular and/or extracurricular activities does the department offer towards exposure to diversity? Do these activities provide adequate opportunities for students to be exposed to the perspective or underrepresented groups?

Do the students have access to appropriate academic support services? Describe the academic support services and comment on their adequacy and appropriateness.

PART 4 – Faculty

Are faculty competencies/credentials appropriate to the level of the program, and do they at least meet the SACSCOC qualifications? Do faculty specialties correspond to the needs of the program? How might the program address needs for additional/different qualifications/expertise?

Is the faculty adequate in number to meet the needs of the program with reasonable and efficient teaching loads and/or credit hour productions? Are the regular-to-adjunct faculty ratios appropriate for the program?

With respect to ethnicity, gender, and academic background, is faculty diversity appropriate for the program?

Does the program use a faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service? Does the system include information from the teaching evaluations of student, alumni, and employer surveys? Are the faculty evaluation procedures adequate and successfully implemented and used?

Are faculty engaged in scholarly, creative, professional association, and service activities that enhance instructional expertise in their areas of specialty?

- Are the faculty involved in research, publication activities, conference presentations, or other scholarly and creative activities that are appropriate for the program?
- Does each faculty member have a professional development plan designed to enhance his or her role as a faculty member? Is there evidence of successful achievements within the plan?
- Are faculty services to UTC and the community adequate? In view of UTC's mission, as a metropolitan institution, does the program have adequate linkages with the community?

Are faculty engaged in the planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success?

PART 5 – Learning Resources

Does the program regularly evaluate its equipment and facilities and pursue necessary improvements?

- Has the program requested/encouraged necessary improvements of its equipment and facilities through appropriate internal mechanisms? Through appropriate external mechanisms?
- Does it appear that the program's resources are appropriate within the context of overall college resources?
- How should needs of the program be prioritized? Could savings be realized from current program operations to fund any new budgetary needs?

Are library holdings and other learning and information resources current and adequate to support the teaching and learning needs of the discipline?

Part 6 – Support

Is the program's operating budget consistent with the needs of the program?

- Considering current budget constraints, what are the most pressing resource needs of the program?

Does the program have a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost effectiveness?

Is the program responsive to local, state, regional and national needs of the discipline?

PART 7 – Summary Recommendations

Overall, what are your impressions of the program?

- What are the major strengths of the program?
- What are the major weaknesses of the program?

What goals would you suggest the program set for the next five years? Please list goals in order of priority (i.e., the most important goal first, followed by the second most important goal, etc.)

How can the program work to achieve these goals over the next five years?

- Considering current budget constraints, what are the most realistic strategies the program can use to achieve the highest priority goals?
- What goals would require additional resources? What level of resources would these goals require? How might the program secure these resources?