



2025-2031

Academic Program Review

Graduate Program Packet

Prepared by the Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA)

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 OAA	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 Accreditation and Assessment (OAA) works closely with academic deans and department heads to coordinate the program review process on the UTC campus. OAA 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 OAA program review liaison, **Cindy Williamson** (ext. 4288 or Cynthia-Williamson@utc.edu), Director of Accreditation and Assessment. If she is unavailable and you need immediate assistance, please contact Grace Peters (ext. 5556 or Grace-O-Peters@utc.edu), Outcomes Assessment Management Analyst.

Contacts:

Cindy Williamson	423-425-4288	Cynthia-Williamson@utc.edu
Grace Peters	423-425-5556	Grace-O-Peters@utc.edu

Overview of Activities

Timeline

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. It is imperative that the items in bold be completed prior to the deadline.

Step #	Description	Timeframe/Deadline
Step 1	Meet with OAA staff to discuss academic program review process	October
Step 2	Assign self-study responsibilities	October
Step 3	Review data from OAA	October
Step 4	Submit nominees for external reviewers*	November
Step 5	Conduct self-study and prepare report	October, November, and December
Step 6	Submit initial draft of self-study report*	Beginning of January
Step 7	Submit final version of self-study report to the provost, the dean, and OAA*	Mid-February
Step 8	Schedule and make arrangements for external reviewer site visit	February
Step 9	Distribution of materials (agenda, self-study, etc.)	February or March
Step 10	Conduct external reviewer site visit	March or April
Step 11	External reviewer submits completed Rubric to department head and director of OAA*	March or April
Step 12	External reviewer submits completed final narrative report to department head and director of OAA*	March, April, or May
Step 13	Department submits charges	March, April, or May
Step 14	Department develops a plan to address recommendations of reviewer and self-study	September
Step 15	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

***All documents will be submitted electronically**

Activity Details

STEP 1: Meet with OAA staff to discuss academic program review process

The department head and any other representatives who have been selected will have a meeting with the director of accreditation and assessment and outcomes assessment management analyst from OAA. You will be contacted by OAA to schedule this meeting.

STEP 2: 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 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. OAA will work with those responsible for the self-study to provide data, assist with interpretation of guidelines, and offer staff support.

STEP 3: Review data from OAA

OAA will provide departments with a [Program Overview](#) file, which contains information to assist in conducting and supporting the self-study. This information consists of data related to students, curriculum, faculty, diversity, and resources.

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 at a peer or aspirational peer institution to UTC, be employed at the level of full professor, 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 should make sure their top candidate is willing and available to serve in the role within the necessary timeframe. Then, submit at least three external reviewer nominees (along with information on their credentials), in order of preference, to OAA for qualification verification. **The list of candidates needs to be submitted to OAA by mid-November at the latest.** Once qualifications have been verified, OAA will submit the nominees to the provost for approval. Please make sure that the reviewer is approved by the dean and provost before officially inviting the reviewer for the in-person site visit (hereafter referred to as site visit).

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 OAA. OAA will review the draft for completeness and will then offer advice to the department regarding the report's completeness, accuracy, and style. After receiving input from OAA, the department will be ready to prepare its final draft. This draft should represent a consensus of the faculty, and agreement among the department head, dean, and OAA. **The initial draft of the self-study needs to be submitted by the beginning of January**

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 the provost, the dean, and OAA. Along with the self-study, send the reviewer's rubric to the provost and the dean so they can see the specific criteria under review. **Submit the final version of the self-study report to the provost, the dean, and OAA by mid-February.**

STEP 8: Schedule and make arrangements for the external reviewer site visit by the end of February

After the dean and provost approve the external reviewer, the department is ready to schedule and make arrangements for the site visit. Make sure to check the availability of everyone meeting with the reviewer and schedule visits and meetings accordingly.

Send the reviewer the Letter of Agreement and after it is returned send a copy of it to OAA along with the official dates of the visit. External reviewers should plan for 1 ½ - 2 days. UTC will allocate [\\$2,400](#) for the site visit, which includes travel, lodging, meal expenses, and an honorarium (\$1,200) 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 site visit. The department is also responsible for handling logistical plans/issues for the reviewer while on campus (transportation, parking, access to wi-fi, etc.).

STEP 9: Distribution of materials

At least two weeks prior to the scheduled site visit **send the final agenda and the final draft of the self-study to all members participating in the review**, and if not already done, send to the provost, the dean, and OAA.

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, vice provosts (as needed), the dean of the library, and the director of accreditation and assessment. The external reviewer 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 to department head and director of accreditation and assessment in OAA

Before leaving campus, the external reviewer must (1) complete and submit the program review Rubric required by THEC, and (2) participate in exit interview with the department head, dean, Academic Affairs administrators (provost or provost designee), and the director of accreditation and assessment.

STEP 12: External Reviewer submits completed final narrative report to department head and director of accreditation and assessment in OAA

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 OAA.

STEP 13: Department submits charges

After the reviewer's narrative report is received the department will submit charges to the OAA account number provided for the costs outlined on page 26.

STEP 14: 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. **Submit plan to OAA electronically by September.**

STEP 15: 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 part of the ongoing outcomes assessment/institutional effectiveness plans that are due from departments in September of each year. Departments should plan assessment strategies that will allow them to evaluate the recommended approaches on an ongoing basis using both direct (comprehensive exam, licensure exam, portfolio, rubric, thesis, etc.) and indirect measures (course grades, surveys, count, 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 Quality Assurance 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.



Purpose:

All academic programs are required to engage in regular reviews of curricula—including content, progression, and organization at the associate’s, baccalaureate, and/or graduate levels—to enhance and improve the curriculum. This review is the responsibility of program faculty, who need to regularly review the curriculum based on evidence and/or comparison with best practices. This rubric provides the criteria for evaluating the quality of program reviews.

Performance Levels:

The rubric provides a four-point scale: *Exceeds Standards/Expectations* (3); *Meets Standards/Expectations* (2); *Does Not Meet Standards/Expectations* (1); *No Evidence of Standards/Expectations* (0), and *NA (not applicable)*. The performance description provided for Performance Level 2/Meets Standards/Expectations is the “anchor” description for the rubric; higher performance than what is articulated for Level 2 should be given a score of 3. Lower performance than Level 2 would receive a score of 1 or zero (0). **A zero score should be used when there is no evidence of any good faith attempt to meet the standard. Any score of Zero requires feedback from the reviewer(s) that provides a rationale for the score. Feedback on other scores is optional.**

Institution: _____

Degree Level and Designation*: _____

Program Title*: _____

CIP Code*: _____

*Please note: Information provided should match the [Academic Program Inventory](#).

Reviewer Name: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Reviewer Title: _____

Reviewer Title: _____

Reviewer Signature: _____

Reviewer Signature: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____



All academic programs are required to engage in regular reviews of curricula—including content, progression, and organization at the associate’s, baccalaureate, and/or graduate levels—to enhance and improve the curriculum. This review is the responsibility of program faculty, who need to regularly review the curriculum based on evidence and/or comparison with best practices. This rubric provides the criteria for evaluating the quality of program reviews.

Directions: Please rate the academic program’s performance by selecting the rating that is *best aligned* with evidence provided by the program. Indicate your selection in the far-right column with a numeric score from 0-3. See the “performance levels” information above for more detail. **A zero score should be used when there is no evidence of any good faith attempt to meet the standard. Any score of Zero requires feedback from the reviewer(s) that provides a rationale for the score. Feedback on other scores is optional.**

Category	Item	3 Exceeds Standard/ Expectations	2 Meets Standard / Expectations	1 Does Not Meet Standard / Expectations	0 No Evidence of Attempting to Meet Standard / Expectations	Score (0-3)
Curriculum	C1 - The program ensures courses are offered regularly.					
Curriculum	C2 - The program ensures that students can make timely progress towards their degree.					
Curriculum	C3 - The program incorporates pedagogical and/or technological innovations that enhance student learning into the curriculum.					
Curriculum	C4 - The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program objectives and student learning outcomes.					
Curriculum	C5 - The curricular content of the program reflects current standards and best practices in the discipline.					
Curriculum	C6 - The curriculum progressively challenges students to effectively prepare them for careers.					
Curriculum	C7 - The curriculum fosters the continued development of and the presentation of results and/or ideas effectively and clearly in both written and oral discourse.					

Category	Item	3 Exceeds Standard/ Expectations	2 Meets Standard / Expectations	1 Does Not Meet Standard / Expectations	0 No Evidence of Attempting to Meet Standard / Expectations	Score (0-3)
Curriculum	C8 - The curriculum fosters ongoing student engagement in discipline-specific research and/or professional practice and training experiences.					
Curriculum	C9 - The program offers structured co-curricular activities that enhance and support student learning outcomes and/or professional development.					
Economic Development and Program Sustainability	EDPS1 - The program demonstrates responsiveness to local, regional, state, and/or national workforce needs.					
Economic Development and Program Sustainability	EDPS2 - The program identifies applicable workforce, skills-based, and/or disciplinary trends and uses the information to improve the program.					
Economic Development and Program Sustainability	EDPS3 - The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.					
Economic Development and Program Sustainability	EDPS4 - The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					
Economic Development and Program Sustainability	EDPS5 - The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.					
Faculty	F1 - Full-time and part-time faculty credentials align with program requirements and accreditation guidelines, supporting effective instruction and student success.					
Faculty	F2 - The program maintains faculty staffing levels to meet the needs of the program.					
Faculty	F3 - The program implements clearly defined, transparent, and fair processes to evaluate faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship, creative activities, and service.					

Category	Item	3 Exceeds Standard/ Expectations	2 Meets Standard / Expectations	1 Does Not Meet Standard / Expectations	0 No Evidence of Attempting to Meet Standard / Expectations	Score (0-3)
Faculty	F4 - The institution provides ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty members as teachers, scholars, and practitioners, consistent with the institutional mission.					
Faculty	F5 - The faculty are actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and are designed to advance learning and student success.					
Learning Outcomes	LO1 - Program objectives and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.					
Learning Outcomes	LO2 - The program implements a structured process to collect and analyze evidence to evaluate achievement of program objectives and student learning outcomes.					
Learning Outcomes	LO3 - The program uses the results from evaluation of program objectives and student learning outcomes to seek continuous improvement.					
Learning Outcomes	LO4 - The program objectives and student learning outcomes align with the institution's mission					
Learning Resources	LR1 -The program faculty has access to resources/professional development opportunities to support teaching and learning activities.					
Learning Resources	LR2 - The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall institutional resources.					
Learning Resources	LR3 - The program provides defined resources and support services to facilitate research, creative activities, and/or scholarly publication appropriate to the discipline and program level.					

Category	Item	3 Exceeds Standard/ Expectations	2 Meets Standard / Expectations	1 Does Not Meet Standard / Expectations	0 No Evidence of Attempting to Meet Standard / Expectations	Score (0-3)
Student Engagement	SE1 - The program provides students with opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					
Student Engagement	SE2 - The program provides opportunities to introduce students to professional and/or career opportunities within their field of study.					
Student Engagement	SE3 - Students have access to academic support services.					
Student Engagement	SE4 - The program incorporates and values multiple perspectives, experiences, and approaches to learning through its academic and/or professional activities, events, and programming.					
Student Engagement	SE5 - The program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.					

If additional notes are needed, please use the table below. Any score of Zero requires feedback from the reviewer(s) that provides a rationale for the score. Feedback on other scores is optional.

Item Code (i.e. SE4)	Notes

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 a reviewer will use to evaluate your program (see [Reviewer Rubric](#)).

Preface/History

The report should present a **brief** summary of activities and identify factors which 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: Curriculum

1. Curriculum – Criteria for Evaluation	
C1	The program ensures courses are offered regularly.
C2	The program ensures that students can make timely progress towards their degree.
C3	The program incorporates pedagogical and/or technological innovations that enhance student learning into the curriculum.
C4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program objectives and student learning outcomes.
C5	The curricular content of the program reflects current standards and best practices in the discipline.
C6	The curriculum progressively challenges students to effectively prepare them for careers.
C7	The curriculum fosters the continued development of and the presentation of results and/or ideas effectively and clearly in both written and oral discourse.
C8	The curriculum fosters ongoing student engagement in discipline-specific research and/or professional practice and training experiences.
C9	The program offers structured co-curricular activities that enhance and support student learning outcomes and/or professional development.

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 curriculum process:** Describe the process by which the program curriculum is reviewed, revised, and implemented (criterion C1). 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 C2). 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 aligned with the program objectives and student learning outcomes (criterion C4); curricular content reflects current standards and best practices in the discipline (criterion C5); the program incorporates appropriate pedagogical and technological methods to enhance student learning (criterion C3); the curriculum offers students opportunities for ongoing engagement in discipline-specific research and/or professional practice and training experiences (criterion C8). This area might also include reference to how the curriculum fosters the continued development of both oral and written communication skills related to the discipline (criterion C7).
- **SACSCOC outcomes data:** Discuss SACSCOC outcomes data and, as appropriate, identify how your program's SACSCOC outcomes show that your program meets specific evaluation criteria (criterion C4).

- **Curriculum review/revision information:** Discuss any curriculum review/revision activities that have been undertaken. Discuss how the curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly 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 C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, and C8.
- **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 and best practices that you have described (criterion C5) and reference other evaluation criteria that are relevant.
- **Curricular research and professional practice opportunities:** Discuss and describe how the curriculum incorporates appropriate research strategies and provides opportunities for students to participate in ongoing engagement in research and/or professional practice and training experiences (criterion C8). 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.
- **Structured co-curricular activities:** Discuss and describe structured co-curricular activities that enhance and support student learning outcomes and/or professional development (criterion C9). This may include information about student organizations, professional development workshops, guest speaker series, field trips, competitions, and other activities that complement the formal curriculum.
- **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 C5, C6, C7 and C8; a student survey may support criteria C3, C5, C6, and C7) or the placement of students in occupations related to major field of study (may relate to criteria C5, C6, C8, etc.).

Part 2: Economic Development and Program Sustainability

2. Economic Development and Program Sustainability– Criterion for Evaluation	
EDPS1	The program demonstrates responsiveness to local, regional, state, and/or national workforce needs.
EDPS2	The program identifies applicable workforce, skills-based, and/or disciplinary trends and uses the information to improve the program.
EDPS3	The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.
EDPS4	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.
EDPS5	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.

Suggested Information/data for Part 2 of the self-study narrative: A strong self-assessment typically includes the following kinds of information.

- **Responsiveness:** Demonstrate and document ways in which the program has responded to local, regional, state, and/or national workforce needs (criterion EDPS1). These might include curricular changes/updates, professional development programming, etc.
- **Workforce and disciplinary trends:** Describe how the program identifies applicable workforce, skills-based, and/or disciplinary trends and uses the information to improve the program (criterion EDPS2).
- **Graduate data collection and placement:** Describe how the program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates (criterion EDPS3). Include information on how this data is collected and maintained, especially related to placement.
- **Enrollment & graduation rates:** Describe, discuss, and append appropriate documentation relevant to enrollment, graduation, and retention in your program (criterion EDPS4). 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.
- **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 EDPS5). You may want to show how the budget has changed over the past five years in response to the needs of the program.

Part 3: Faculty

3. Faculty – Criterion for Evaluation	
F1	Full-time and part-time faculty credentials align with program requirements and accreditation guidelines, supporting effective instruction and student success.
F2	The program maintains faculty staffing levels to meet the needs of the program.
F3	The program implements clearly defined, transparent, and fair processes to evaluate faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship, creative activities, and service.
F4	The institution provides ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty members as teachers, scholars, and practitioners, consistent with the institutional mission.
F5	The faculty are actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and are designed to advance learning and student success.

Suggested Information/data for Part 3 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 credentials align with program requirements and accreditation guidelines, supporting effective instruction and student success (criterion F1). 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 F1). 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 workload is determined and shared across all faculty (criterion F2). Provide a sample of workloads from the past 3-5 years as supporting documentation. (This might also be used to fulfill criterion F5.)
- **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 F4). 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 F4). 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 the institution provides ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty members as teachers, scholars, and practitioners, consistent with the institutional mission (criterion F4). 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. Describe, discuss, and append information regarding the EDO system to document that each faculty member has a professional development plan designed to enhance his or her role as a faculty member (criterion F5). To fully address criterion F3, also discuss and provide evidence of successful achievements of faculty in relation to their professional development plans.
- **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 F4 and F5)? Describe how faculty are included in the planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure student success (criterion F5).
- **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, scholarship, creative activities and service. Include information for how these evaluation methods are used to improve teaching, scholarship, creative activities and service.
- **Faculty evaluation system:** Discuss the processes and procedures in place in your program to evaluate faculty and improve teaching, scholarship, creative activities, and service (criterion F3). 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 4: Learning Outcomes

4. Learning Outcomes – Criteria for Evaluation	
LO1	Program and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.
LO2	The program implements a structured process to collect and analyze evidence to evaluate achievement of program objectives and student learning outcomes.
LO3	The program uses the results from evaluation of program objectives and student learning outcomes to seek continuous improvement.
LO4	The program objectives and student learning outcomes align with the institution's mission

Suggested information/data for Part 4 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 objectives and student learning outcomes (criterion LO1) and how they align with the institutional mission and vision (criterion LO4).
- **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 LO1, LO2, LO3). 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 objectives and student learning outcomes (criterion LO1) and specify the use of appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement of program outcomes (criterion LO2).
- **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 LO2) and/or make use of information to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion LO3).
- **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 LO2) and how the program made use of survey information to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion LO3).
- **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 LO2) and how the program makes use of job placement data to strengthen the program's effectiveness (criterion LO3).

- **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 LO3).
- **Include additional information as appropriate.**

Part 5: Learning Resources

5. Learning Resources – Criterion for Evaluation	
LR1	The program faculty has access to resources/professional development opportunities to support teaching and learning activities.
LR2	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall institutional resources.
LR3	The program provides defined resources and support services to facilitate research, creative activities, and/or scholarly publication appropriate to the discipline and program level.

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 LR2) 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 (criterion LR1).
- **Library and learning resources support:** Discuss the program's level of library support and how those are appropriate to support teaching and learning (criterion LR1). 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.
- **Research, creative activities, and scholarly publication support:** Describe defined resources and support services to facilitate research, creative activities, and/or scholarly publication appropriate to the discipline and program level (criterion LR3). Include information about research funding opportunities, equipment and facilities for research, support for conference presentations and publications, research mentoring programs, and other resources that support faculty and student scholarly activities.

Part 6: Student Engagement

6. Student Engagement– Criteria for Evaluation	
SE1	The program provides students with opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.
SE2	The program provides opportunities to introduce students to professional and/or career opportunities within their field of study.
SE3	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.
SE4	The program incorporates and values multiple perspectives, experiences, and approaches to learning through its academic and/or professional activities, events, and programming.
SE5	The program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.

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

- **Student evaluation:** Describe how students provide feedback on the program, curriculum, faculty and other opportunities (criterion SE1). 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. Discuss and describe the processes, procedures, and results of student ratings of faculty teaching to document that students have opportunities to regularly evaluate faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness (criterion SE1). If appropriate, you may also wish to include information regarding student, alumni, and employer survey results and/or information regarding programmatic improvements resulting from input from students, alumni, and/or employers.
- **Student professional development opportunities:** Discuss and describe student professional and career opportunities available to program students (criterion SE2). Include information about the extent to which the program encourages students to take advantage of the opportunities provided.
- **Academic support services:** Describe the academic support services available to students and data on their use and effectiveness of those support services (criterion SE3).
- **Multiple perspectives and experiences:** Discuss and describe how the program incorporates and values multiple perspectives, experiences, and approaches to learning through its academic and/or professional activities, events, and programming (criterion SE4).
- **Applied learning opportunities:** Discuss and describe how the program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom (criterion SE5).
- **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 ensure professional and career opportunities specific to the field/discipline (criterion SE2). 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.

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 or current experience as the level of Department Chair or higher at a peer or aspirational peer institution to UTC and is employed at the level of full professor. Peer institutions are not necessarily from a formal list, but rather universities similar to UTC in terms of enrollment size, program offerings, faculty size, and breadth.
- 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, you will submit a transfer voucher to OAA 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 accreditation and assessment 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 OAA know before you confirm the visit. Otherwise, any funds expended in excess of the \$2,200 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 amount.

Item	Details	Amount
Honorarium	Intended for 2 day/2 night review *Note: do not pay honorarium until the evaluator provides narrative report	Suggested \$1,200
Travel Costs	For external reviewer – includes mileage (State mileage rates will apply (currently .625/mile, see http://treasurer.tennessee.edu/travel/reimbursement-rates.htm , airfare, parking, etc.)	\$500
Hotel Expenses	For 2 nights at \$109 per night Suggested lodging: Mayor’s Mansion, Read House, Chattanooga, Springhill Suites Downtown or other local hotel honoring state rate can be found at https://www.utc.edu/sites/default/files/2022-01/Chattanooga%20Preferred%20Hotels%20update%201.19.2022_0.pdf	\$220
Meals	Dinners: \$275 (\$27.5/person X 5 people X 2 dinners) Lunches: \$175 (\$17.5/person X 5 people X 2 lunches) Breakfast: \$30 (one breakfast)	\$480

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

Note: For airfare over \$500, contact OAA for approval.

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 before sending to OAA.
3. OAA and the Dean 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 will be communicated to the Director of Accreditation and Assessment, who will then inform the Department Head and Dean.
2. After the self-study report has been revised based on suggestions from the Dean and OAA, the Provost should review the final version of the report.
3. During the external reviewer site visit, the Provost will meet one-on-one with the reviewer.
4. The Provost or Provost designee 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 OAA

Student Information

- Enrollment Trends
- Degrees Awarded
- Student Retention Rates
- Major Field Test Results
- Student Survey Results (Satisfaction with UTC)
- Employment and Placement
- NSSE-FSSE Combined Results
- ETS Proficiency Profile (Senior Exit) Results
- Student Credit Hours (Fall and Spring)

Curriculum Information

- Enrollment in Courses Offered in Past Two Years
- Student Survey Results (Curriculum)

Faculty Information

- Course Learning Evaluations
- Internal Support
 - SEARCH
 - Faculty Development and Research Grants
 - Professional Development Leave
 - High Impact Practice (HIP) Awards
- External Grants
- Student Credit Hour Production per FTE Faculty (Adjuncts not Included)
- Student Credit Hour Production per FTE Faculty (Adjuncts Included)
- Student Survey Results (Faculty Involvement)

Diversity

- Student Survey Results (Cultural Experience at UTC)

Resources

- Library Holdings of Materials Relevant to Program (through Library)
- Journal List
- 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 on [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 Quality Assurance Funding 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 \$1,200 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 \$1,200 honorarium after our department has received the narrative report of your findings.
- Please save all receipts and turn them into our administrative assistant before you leave campus 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 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 or other location] – department head, reviewer(s), director of accreditation and assessment

9:00 – 9:40 am Meeting with provost

10:00 – 10:40 am Meeting with dean of the college

10:45 – 11:30 am Meeting 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 the dean of the library

4:00 – 4:30 pm Meeting with other administrators (e.g., Walker Center for Teaching & Learning) as deemed necessary

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 or other location] – department head, reviewers, other faculty
9:00 – 9:30 am	Review documents (files, data, etc.) and prepare draft report
9:45 – 11:15 am	Attend a class
11:30-11:45 am	Email the THEC Rubric to OAA <i>prior to</i> exit conference
12:00 – 1:15 pm	Lunch with a small group of department faculty
1:30 – 2:30 pm	Exit Conference – provost or provost designee, dean, department head, reviewers, director of accreditation and assessment

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