



2025-2031

Academic Program Review

**External Reviewer Packet
(Undergraduate Programs)**

Prepared by the Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA)

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 9

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!

Letter of Agreement

[Insert Letter of Agreement from Academic Program Review Packet]

Reviewer Rubric

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2025-2031 Quality Assurance Funding
Baccalaureate Program Review Rubric – **COVER SHEET**



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 and/or advanced study.					
Curriculum	C7 - The curriculum fosters the 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 exposes students to 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

Guidelines for Narrative Report

Part 1 – Curriculum

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program ensures courses are offered regularly? Does the program clearly outline course schedules and rotation patterns that enable students to access required courses when needed?

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program ensures students can make timely progress towards their degree? Are there clear program requirements, course sequences, and advising structures that facilitate on-time completion?

Are appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations included that enhance student learning? Does the evidence demonstrate that the program's instructional practices are 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 self-study demonstrate that the program makes 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.)?

Does the self-study provide evidence that the curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program objectives and student learning outcomes? Is there clear mapping between courses, learning activities, and the stated objectives and outcomes of the program?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the curricular content of the program reflects current standards and best practices in the discipline? Does the program regularly review and revise curriculum content and organization to ensure that it is appropriate and current? Based on your review, will the program need to update the curriculum and/or develop new or alternative offerings in the near future?

Does the curriculum progressively challenge students to effectively prepare them for careers and/or advanced study? Does the self-study demonstrate that the curriculum reflects appropriate depth and rigor? Are the core and advanced courses appropriately balanced? Does the overall curriculum ensure the development of appropriate skills in the following areas: general education, critical thinking skills, research strategies and skills, and computer and technology-related skills (in general and specific to the discipline)?

Does the curriculum foster the development of and the presentation of results and/or ideas effectively and clearly in both written and oral discourse?

Does the curriculum expose students to discipline-specific research and/or professional practice and training experiences?

Does the self-study document structured co-curricular activities that enhance and support student learning outcomes and/or professional development? Are these activities appropriate and accessible to students?

Part 2 – Economic Development and Program Sustainability

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program is responsive to local, regional, state, and/or national workforce needs?

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program identifies applicable workforce, skills-based, and/or disciplinary trends and uses the information to improve the program? Is the program responsive to changing needs of the discipline and workforce?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates? What data does the program collect regarding graduate outcomes, and how is this information used?

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

Based on the evidence provided in the self-study, 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?

PART 3 – Faculty

Are faculty competencies/credentials appropriate to the level of the program, and do they align with program requirements and accreditation guidelines (including SACSCOC qualifications)? Do faculty specialties correspond to the needs of the program? How might the program address needs for additional/different qualifications/expertise?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program maintains faculty staffing levels 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?

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program implements clearly defined, transparent, and fair processes to evaluate faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship, creative activities, and service? Does the system include information from the teaching

evaluations of students, alumni, and employer surveys? Are the faculty evaluation procedures adequate and successfully implemented and used?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the institution provides ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty members as teachers, scholars, and practitioners, consistent with the institutional mission? 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?
- Do faculty 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?

Does the self-study demonstrate that faculty are actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and are designed to advance learning and student success?

Part 4 – Learning Outcomes

Are the program objectives and student learning outcomes clearly identified and measurable?

- Has the program clearly specified program objectives and student learning outcomes in the self-study?
- Are they measurable and appropriate for the program level (undergraduate) and for UTC?

Does the program implement a structured process to collect and analyze evidence to evaluate achievement of program objectives and student learning outcomes? Are the processes appropriate for such evaluation and/or for the program?

Does the program use the results from evaluation of program objectives and student learning outcomes to seek continuous improvement? Does the self-study demonstrate how the program makes 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?

Do the program objectives and student learning outcomes align with the institution's mission? Does the evidence demonstrate clear alignment between the program's mission, vision, and goal statements with the institution's mission?

Part 5 – Learning Resources

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program faculty has access to resources and professional development opportunities to support teaching and learning activities?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities and pursues necessary improvements?

- Based on the evidence provided and observations during the site visit, does it appear that the program's resources are appropriate within the context of overall college and institutional resources?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program provides defined resources and support services to facilitate research, creative activities, and/or scholarly publication appropriate to the discipline and program level? Are library holdings and other learning and information resources current and adequate to support the teaching and learning needs of the discipline?

Part 6 – Student Engagement

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program provides students with opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness? What procedures are in place to ensure and document that the program provides students with regular opportunities to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching? Based on the evidence provided, how well is this information used to improve the program?

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program provides opportunities to introduce students to professional and/or career opportunities within their field of study? Do students have adequate opportunities to participate in professional and career opportunities appropriate to the discipline?

Based on the evidence provided in the self-study and observations during the site visit, do students have access to appropriate academic support services? Describe the academic support services and comment on their adequacy and appropriateness.

Does the self-study demonstrate that the program incorporates and values multiple perspectives, experiences, and approaches to learning through its academic and/or professional activities, events, and programming? What curricular and/or extracurricular activities does the program offer towards exposure to diverse perspectives and multiple approaches to learning? Do these activities provide adequate opportunities for students to be exposed to the perspectives of underrepresented groups?

Does the self-study provide evidence that the program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom? 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?

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?