



2020-2025

Academic Program Review

Reviewer Rubric (Undergraduate Programs)

Prepared by the Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA)

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	Dennis Earl	Name	
Title	Professor of Philosophy	Title	
Institution	Coastal Carolina University	Institution	
Signature		Signature	
Date	March 5, 2025	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.*