



Tennessee Higher Education Commission

Quality Assurance Funding

2015-20 Cycle Standards





RUSS DEATON
Interim Executive Director

STATE OF TENNESSEE
HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
PARKWAY TOWERS, SUITE 1900
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-0830
(615) 741-3605
FAX: (615) 741-6230

BILL HASLAM
Governor

July 30, 2015

Tennessee Public Community Colleges and Universities,

At the July 23, 2015 Tennessee Higher Education Commission meeting, the Commission approved the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding standards. Previously known as Performance Funding, the Quality Assurance Funding program has served as a valuable means of incentivizing institutional excellence and rewarding continuous improvement for almost 40 years.

The 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding standards align with the goals and priorities as set forth in the 2015-25 Higher Education Master Plan. The standards also serve as a complimentary quality assessment mechanism to the Outcomes Based Funding Formula.

Going forward, THEC staff will continue to work with the University of Tennessee, Tennessee Board of Regents and institutions in implementing and evaluating progress on the standards for the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Russ Deaton".

Russ Deaton

cc: Betty Dandridge Johnson
Victoria Harpool

DATE: July 23, 2015**SUBJECT:** Quality Assurance Funding 2015-20 Cycle**ACTION RECOMMENDED:** Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tennessee was the pioneer in developing quality based funding for higher education institutions and has become a model for states seeking to promote the highest standards and continuous improvement. Performance Funding incentivizes meritorious performance and provides a means of assessing the progress of student learning at public community colleges and universities.

Planning for Performance Funding, began in 1974 with collaboration between higher education institutions, governing boards, THEC and a national advisory panel. This collaboration resulted in a set of research based quality standards used to guide institutions as they seek to improve student learning while carrying out their unique missions. These standards include program evaluation and accreditation results, licensure rates, general education and major field assessment scores, and retention and graduation rates.

In 1979, Performance Funding was implemented to promote academic excellence and incentivize institutional improvement. Success on the quality standards allows institutions to earn a percentage of funds over their annual operating budgets. In addition, Performance Funding requires each institution to build mature institutional effectiveness operations, and evidence of these operations holds them in good standing with institutional and specialized accreditors.

Quality standards for Performance Funding are evaluated every five years to ensure alignment with the public agenda and state high education priorities. A committee comprised of Commission staff, governing boards, and institutional faculty and staff collaborate to revise the standards that are then approved by the Commission. As a result, each five year cycle has particular defining features in addition to the common quality standards. The 1988-1992 cycle saw a shift in emphasis from the process of assessment to performance outcomes. The 2005-10 cycle emphasized solidifying articulation and transfer agreements. In the 2010-15 cycle, traditional productivity measures of retention and persistence to graduation were ceded to the Outcomes Based Funding Formula leaving Performance Funding to focus solely on quality standards.

Beginning with the 2015-20 cycle, Performance Funding will be known as Quality Assurance Funding (QAF). The change in name helps to distinguish the mission of Quality Assurance Funding from the Outcomes Based Funding Formula. The 2015-20 cycle standards reflect current state priorities outlined in the 2015-25 Master Plan and guided by the Drive to 55 and continue to challenge institutions to promote the highest standards and strive for excellence. The 2015-20 QAF standards reflect the professional judgment of the Advisory Committee which brought together

representatives from institutions and University of Tennessee and Tennessee Board of Regents system staff. A Scoring Sub-Committee also worked with THEC staff to develop operational strategies in the evaluation of the standards. The Commission staff expresses appreciation to both committees for their contributions to the 2015-20 QAF standards.

2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding

Points by Standard

Standard	Community College	University
I. Student Learning and Engagement	75	75
• <i>General Education Assessment</i>	15	15
• <i>Major Field Assessment</i>	15	15
• <i>Academic Programs</i>	15	25
• <i>Institutional Satisfaction Study</i>	10	10
• <i>Adult Learner Success</i>	10	10
• <i>Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement</i>	10	NA
II. Student Access and Success	25	25
TOTAL	100	100

Defining Features

Academic Programs

When an appropriate accrediting agency is not available, institutions utilize program evaluations to ensure that departmental standards remain high. Institutions may utilize the Program Review or Academic Audit to assess the quality of programs on campus through a self study and external review. As part of the 2015-20 cycle standards review, the Program Review and Academic Audit rubrics have been updated to reflect current best practices and more closely align with SACS-COC standards.

Institutional Satisfaction Study

In the 2015-20 QAF cycle, community colleges and universities will follow a unique schedule to engage various institutional stakeholders. Community colleges will use the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) as they welcome students utilizing the Tennessee Promise scholarship to their campuses. Universities will employ the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and Performance Enhancement Group (PEG) Alumni Study survey to evaluate satisfaction across the institution.

Adult Learner Success

A major component of Tennessee Reconnect and the 2015-25 Public Agenda is engaging adult learners. In order to support institutions in this critical mission, QAF has introduced an Adult Learner Success standard focused on the unique experiences and challenges facing adult students. The standard utilizes both qualitative and quantitative measures to gauge success. Institutions will perform a self-study, gather feedback from adult students

and develop an action plan to better serve the needs of adult students. The standard will also examine adult student retention and graduation rates.

Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement

The community college job placement standard will now utilize data from the P-20 data system. The P-20 system combines data from the Department of Education, Department of Labor and THEC and includes individuals employed in Tennessee. The P-20 Data System allows for statewide job placement analysis that is uniform across all community colleges.

Student Access and Success

Quality Assurance Funding will focus institutional attention on increasing the access and success of focus populations around the state. In the 2015-20 cycle, institutions will select five populations on which to focus particular attention and resources. Veterans have been added as a focus population for the 2015-20 QAF cycle. Universities may also now select to focus on specific populations to increase the number of graduates in masters and doctoral programs.

2015-2020 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle



Advisory Committee

Dr. Karen Adsit

Assistant Provost

University of Tennessee Chattanooga

Dr. Tristan Denley

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Tennessee Board of Regents

Dr. Allana Hamilton

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Northeast State Community College

Dr. Katherine High

Vice President for Academic Affairs & Student Success

University of Tennessee

Dr. Sharon Huo

Associate Provost

Tennessee Technological University

Dr. Susan Martin

Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor

University of Tennessee Knoxville

Dr. Warren Nichols

Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges

Tennessee Board of Regents

Dr. Thomas Rakes

Professor Educational Studies

University of Tennessee Martin

Dr. Randy Schulte

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Tennessee Board of Regents

Dr. Janet Smith

President

Columbia State Community College

Dr. Kim Sokoya

Associate Dean for Graduate and Executive

Education

Middle Tennessee State University

Scoring Sub Committee

Chris Brewer

*Assistant Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness,
Planning and Research*

Middle Tennessee State University

Sarah Cooper

Information Research Analyst

Jackson State Community College

Michael McFall

Assistant Director, Institutional Research & Assessment

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Don Meyers

Associate Director of Institutional Research

Southwest Tennessee Community College

Ted Washington

Associate Vice President for Planning & Assessment

Nashville State Community College

Program Evaluation Committee

Karen Adsit

Assistant Provost
University of Tennessee Chattanooga

Mary Alberech

Associate Vice Provost for Accreditation
University of Tennessee Knoxville

Pamela Ashmore

Department Head and Professor of Anthropology
University of Tennessee Chattanooga

Katherine Bailey

Research Analyst and Academic Audit Coordinator
Austin Peay State University

Karen Brunner

*Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness,
Planning and Research*
Roane State Community College

Susan Graybeal

Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness
Northeast State Community College

Sharon Huo

Associate Provost
Tennessee Technological University

Denise King

Vice President for Academic Affairs
Cleveland State Community College

William Langston

Professor of Psychology
Middle Tennessee State University

Joni Lenig

*Associate Vice President of Faculty, Curriculum
and Programs*
Columbia State Community College

Jeffery Roberts

Chairperson Department of History
Tennessee Technological University

Victoria Seng

Dean of Graduate Studies
University of Tennessee Martin

Randy Shulte

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Board of Regents

Keith Sisson

University College Graduate Program Coordinator
University of Memphis

Karen Ward

Professor of Nursing
Middle Tennessee State University

Ted Washington

*Associate Vice President for Planning and
Assessment*
Nashville State Community College

THEC Staff

Dr. Russ Deaton, Interim Executive Director

Betty Dandridge Johnson, Associate Executive Director for Academic Affairs

Victoria Harpool, Assistant Executive Director for Academic Affairs

Herbert Brown, Academic Affairs Analyst

Courtney Lennartz, Academic Affairs Graduate Assistant

2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Table of Contents



Student Learning and Engagement

General Education Assessment.....	1
Major Field Assessment.....	3
Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation.....	6
Institutional Satisfaction Studies: University.....	10
Institutional Satisfaction Studies: Community College.....	14
Adult Learner Success.....	18
Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement.....	20

Student Access and Success

Focus Populations.....	21
------------------------	----

Appendices

Appendix A – General Education Assessment Selection Form	23
Appendix B – Approved Major Field Tests.....	25
Appendix C – Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Plan.....	28
Appendix D – Approved Accreditation Agencies.....	30
Appendix E – Program Review Rubric: Certificate and Associate Programs.....	33
Appendix F – Program Review Rubric: Baccalaureate Programs.....	36
Appendix G – Program Review Rubric: Graduate Programs.....	39
Appendix H – Academic Audit Rubric: Undergraduate Programs.....	42
Appendix I – Academic Audit Rubric: Graduate Programs.....	46
Appendix J – Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report	50
Appendix K – Adult Learner Success Scoring Rubrics.....	53
Appendix L – TN Job Market Placement Trends.....	58
Appendix M – Focus Populations Selection Form	61

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

General Education Assessment

Points	15 points
Purpose	This standard is designed to provide incentives to institutions for improvements in the quality of their undergraduate general education program as measured by the performance of graduates on an approved standardized test of general education.
Evaluation	Foundation testing is measured by the overall performance (mean score) of an institution. National norms will be drawn from the same population as the institution, e.g., for two-year institutions, the national norm will be drawn from all two-year institutions utilizing the particular instrument chosen by the institution.
Process	<p>Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Institutions must use the California Critical Thinking and Skills Test (CCTST) or ETS Proficiency Profile to measure performance for this indicator. Institutions using ETS Proficiency Profile are permitted to select from either the standard or abbreviated test.• Institutions must utilize the same assessment for the duration of the 2015-20 cycle.• Institutions notified the Commission and governing board staff of their general education test selection by May 1, 2015. <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Testing for this standard will be applied to all undergraduate students who have applied for graduation (either at the associate or baccalaureate level).<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Students who are pursuing certificate degrees are excluded from testing.○ Four-year institutions should not test students in associate degree programs.○ Two-year institutions should not test students receiving an associate degree awarded via Reverse Transfer. Reverse transfer is a credit review of degree seeking students who transfer from a community college to a four year institution prior to receipt of an associate degree to determine if and when the students complete the associate degree requirements and, if so, to award them an associate degree.• Students graduating in all terms of the academic year (summer, fall, and spring terms) are subject to testing.• Institutions testing all graduates may exclude students from testing for “good cause.” Good cause exemptions must be supported by documentation from the institution’s chief academic officer. Exceptions should not be approved for simple inconvenience. This material should be available for review by Commission staff if needed. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Institutions may apply to the Commission for permission to test a representative sample of graduates. Any institution requesting to use sampling must meet a minimum threshold of a 95 percent confidence level with a margin of error of 3.• Institution must also submit a Sampling Plan that includes an explanation of how graduates are selected for sampling across the institution.

Reporting

- A copy of the notification letter from the testing company must accompany the annual Quality Assurance Funding Reporting Template.

Scoring

- Performance on general education assessment will be evaluated in two ways:
 1. For years 1-3, comparison of the institutional average score for a given cycle year with the national average for that year (Table 1) and
 2. For years 4-5, comparisons of the institutional average score for a given cycle year with the national average (Table 2A) and the three-year moving average (Table 2B).
- Comparisons will be made by dividing the institutional average by its national average (or three-year average) for that cycle year (no percent attainment may exceed 100 percent). The overall percentages for the national norm and institutional trends will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage which will be compared with the tables below to award points for the General Education standard.
- For the national comparison, institutions must use the appropriate reference group based on the national average available for the general education assessment. (For example, if Austin Peay State University elects to use the ETS Proficiency Profile exam, their institutional average will be compared with the national norms for all other Master's level institutions.)

Table 1: General Education Scoring Table Scoring for Years 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 National Norm Comparison																
Average	100%	99% - 98%	97% - 96%	95% - 94%	93% - 92%	91% - 89%	88% - 86%	85% - 84%	83% - 82%	81% - 80%	79% - 78%	77% - 76%	75% - 74%	73% - 72%	71% - 70%	>70%
Points Awarded	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 2A: General Education Scoring Table Scoring for Years 2018-19 and 2019-20 National Norm Comparison												
Average	100%	99%- 97%	96%- 94%	93%- 91%	90%- 88%	87%- 85%	84%- 82%	81%- 79%	78%- 75%	74%- 70%	> 70%	
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Table 2B: General Education Scoring Table Scoring for Years 2018-19 and 2019-20 Institutional Trend						
Average	100%	99% - 94%	93% - 88%	87% - 82%	81% - 75%	Below 74%
Points Awarded	5	4	3	2	1	0

References Appendix A – General Education Assessment Selection Form

- Websites**
- California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) www.insightassessment.com
 - ETS Proficiency Profile <http://www.ets.org>

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Major Field Assessment

Points	15 points
Purpose	This indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of major field programs as evaluated by the performance of graduates on approved examinations.
Evaluation	A major field will be considered successful if the assessment score is either at or above the comparison score (national or institutional average). All programs will be reported once during the 2015-20 cycle with the exception of licensure programs. All licensure programs will be reported annually.
Process	Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For purposes of this standard, a major field is defined as all programming at one degree level bearing the same name.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Example: B.A. and B.S. in Psychology would be considered one field.○ Other closely related fields may be considered as one field at the request of the institution and the approval of the governing board and THEC.• If both associate and baccalaureate degrees are offered in a field and if testing is appropriate to both levels (e.g., nursing), then all graduates at both levels must be tested and reported.• All students graduating in the fall and spring terms must be tested. Exceptions for individual students (for good cause) must be approved by the chief academic officer. Exceptions should not be approved for simple inconvenience.• All scores for licensure programs at the associate and baccalaureate level will be reported annually. Licensure programs include engineering, allied health, nursing and teacher education.• Institutions must submit a testing schedule which ensures that approximately 20 percent of programs are tested each year. Testing schedules must be approved by THEC staff.

National Assessments

- Prior to the beginning of the cycle, a list of approved major field assessments will be developed by THEC. Appendix B lists all approved major field tests.
- During the cycle, assessments may be submitted to THEC for consideration for inclusion in the approved list.

Local Assessments

- Institutions may develop local tests in major areas in which national standardized tests are not available, or where faculty do not consider available tests appropriate.
- Local tests can be made by a single institution or in concert with other institutions.
- Plans for new local tests should be submitted to THEC for prior approval. Plans for local test construction must include:
 - Plan for Creating a Locally Developed Major Field Assessment form
 - Credentials of cooperating institutional staff and/or external consultants

- Institutions should provide ample time for test development and administration. Baseline year testing scores will be compared to reporting year scores for QAF scoring purposes. Refer to Appendix C for additional information guidelines regarding test construction, timelines, and reporting requirements.

Locally Developed Major Field Assessment Timeline	
1st Year: Planning	Institutional Actions
<i>Summer/Fall Semesters</i>	• Complete the Plan form and submit to THEC
	• Create assessment
	• Secure institutional staff and/or 2 external consultants to review assessment
	• Send copies of all materials to campus coordinator
<i>Spring Semester</i>	• Make adjustments to assessment
	• Pilot administration
2nd Year: Baseline	• Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms using the new test. Test results will be used for comparison in the reporting year.
3rd Year: Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms • Institution must report both baseline year and reporting year data for scoring.

Exemptions

- Programs will be exempt from the requirements of the Major Field Assessment standard if the program meets any of the following conditions:
 1. Certificate program
 2. Performance-oriented program in the fine or performing arts
 3. Interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, or self-designed to include several related fields
 4. Low producing
 - Associate programs that have not generated an average of 10 graduates per year or a minimum of 30 graduates during the time period 2011-12 to 2013-14.
 - Baccalaureate programs that have not generated an average of 10 graduates per year, or a minimum of 50 graduates during the time period 2009-10 to 2013-14.
 5. Phase-out or inactive status at the beginning or during the cycle
 6. New program that has not reached maturity status in the 2015-20 cycle
 - Associate degree program maturity: three-year period after implementation. New associate degree programs approved by the Commission after the 2015-20 cycle begins, unless they are excluded due to one of the other exemptions and reach program maturity during the cycle must be scheduled for testing.
 - Since baccalaureate programs require five years to reach maturity, new baccalaureate programs that were approved after July 2015 would not mature until 2020 and thus would be exempt from the major field testing requirement.
- Institutions may submit other programs for exemption through their respective governing board for consideration by the THEC.

Scoring

Procedures

- Comparisons are made by dividing the institutional average by its comparison score average for that reporting year (no attainment may exceed 100%).
- The overall percentage will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage point which will be compared with Table 3 to award points for the Major Field Assessment standard.
- Scoring is cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the 2015-20 cycle.

National Assessments

- Programs that use standardized tests (e.g., ETS, ACAT) will use the national comparison based on Carnegie classification or other appropriate comparison
- All licensure programs will be compared with appropriate national pass rate.
- A copy of the score notification letter from the testing company must accompany the yearly Quality Assurance Funding Template.

Local Assessments

- Programs utilizing locally developed assessment will use their prior score as reported in the 2010-15 cycle.
- Programs utilizing a new locally developed assessment will use the baseline year score for comparison.

Table 3: Major Field Assessment Scoring Table

Table 3: Major Field Assessment Scoring Table																
% Institution to National or Institutional Average	100%	99% to 98%	96% to 97%	95% to 94%	93% to 92%	91% to 89%	88% to 86%	85% to 84%	83% to 82%	81% to 80%	79% to 78%	77% to 76%	75% to 74%	73% to 72%	71% to 70%	Below 70%
Points	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

References

- Appendix B – Approved Major Field Tests
- Appendix C – Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Plan

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation

Points	15 points community colleges and 25 for universities
Purpose	This indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation.
Evaluation	For those programs that are accreditable, evaluation will be based on the percentage of eligible programs which are accredited. For those programs that are non-accreditable, evaluation will be based on a set of objective standards. Institutions will have the flexibility to use either the Program Review or Academic Audit to evaluate non-accreditable programs.

Accreditation Eligible Programs

- A program is defined as eligible for the accreditation indicator if there is a recognized agency which accredits programs for that field and degree level.
- Only programs which appear on the Tennessee Higher Education Commission Academic Program Inventory are eligible under this standard. Concentrations are not covered under this standard, even if separately accredited.
- Exceptions: All academic programs should be considered for accreditation, unless they meet one of the following:
 1. Appropriate accrediting agency does not exist
 2. Obstacles to accreditation because of program organization or curriculum

Approved Accreditation Agencies

- THEC staff will maintain a list of approved accrediting agencies and institutions should seek accreditation from the list of Approved Accreditation Agencies located in Appendix D.
- THEC reserves the right to determine if program accreditation is consistent with the institutional mission and/or the State Master Plan for Higher Education.
- Institutions or groups of institutions may petition THEC through their respective governing boards to add or delete accrediting agencies from the approved list. An agency may be added or deleted upon affirmation from a majority of the institutions affected by the nominated agency.
- If an accrediting agency is added to the approved list, current programs impacted by this decision will be exempt from achieving accreditation during the 2015-20 cycle.
- If an accrediting agency is removed from the list and the program accreditation expires before the 2015-20 cycle ends, the academic program will be subject to non-accreditable program evaluation during the 2015-20 cycle.

Reporting

- Each institution submitted to THEC documentation in support of all accredited programs by July 1, 2015.
- Proposals for changes in the eligibility of accredited programs must be submitted to THEC staff by January 1 of each year of the cycle.
- If multiple programs are accredited by a single agency, each program counts separately for this indicator.

- A program eligible for accreditation by more than one agency will be counted only once for this indicator, although all accreditation must be reported so that THEC can maintain accurate accreditation information.

Scoring

- The number of accredited programs will be divided by the total number of accreditable programs to calculate the overall accreditation percentage.
- This percentage is used to generate points for the standard based on the Table 4: Accreditation Scoring.

Table 4: Accreditation Scoring Table						
% Accredited Programs	100%	99% - 94%	93% - 88%	87% - 82%	81% - 75%	Below 74%
Points	5	4	3	2	1	0

Evaluation Eligible Programs

- All non-accreditable certificate and degree programs must be evaluated through Program Review or Academic Audit. Institutions have the flexibility to determining which evaluation method is most suitable for the program.
- If the program contains an embedded certificate, the review of this program will be completed as part of the associate degree program. An embedded certificate is defined as a technical certificate program with the following characteristics:
 - Technical certificate approved by the Tennessee Board of Regents
 - Technical certificate whose curriculum, content and requirements are contained within the greater requirements of a related associate degree program
 - Technical certificate for which the related degree program assumes responsibility for quality control and assurance.
- Exceptions:
 1. Non-accreditable programs in phase-out or inactive status at the beginning of the cycle
 2. Non-accreditable programs that become inactive during the cycle

Methodology

- All university programs approved by THEC as of November 2014 and community college programs approved by TBR as of June 2015 are subject to evaluation during the 2015-20 cycle.
- Program Maturity
 - New programs approved after January 2015 and reaching program maturity during the 2015-20 cycle must be evaluated.
 - Program Maturity:
 - Certificate and associate degree programs: three-year period after implementation
 - Baccalaureate and Masters programs: five-year period after implementation.
 - Doctoral programs: seven-year period after implementation
- Prior to program maturity, new programs are subject to the annual Post-Approval Monitoring guidelines as set forth in THEC Academic Policy A1.1 for Academic Proposals.

Schedule

- Each institution notified THEC of its schedule and evaluation type for all non-accreditable programs by July 1, 2015.
- All institutions must schedule non-accreditable certificate and degree programs within a five to seven year period. The program review cycle mirrors the average accrediting cycle award of seven years.
- Care must be taken in establishing the review schedule, for it is expected that the institution will strictly adhere to it.
- Requests for changes to the schedule must be approved by THEC staff by January 1 of the reporting year.

Program Review

- The Program Review must be conducted by at least one qualified out-of-state external reviewer. Selection of reviewers is subject to review by governing boards and THEC staff. Reviewers must complete the appropriate Program Review Rubric by degree designation. See Appendix E, F and G.
- Reporting
 - For each non-accreditable program evaluated through Program Review, the following must accompany the institution's Quality Assurance Funding reporting template:
 - Program Review Rubric,
 - Reviewer's narrative report and
 - Vitas of the external reviewer(s)

Academic Audit

- The Academic Audit is a faculty-driven model of ongoing self-reflection, collaboration, teamwork and peer feedback. It is based on structured conversations among faculty, stakeholders and peer reviewers all focused on a common goal: to improve quality processes in teaching and learning and thus enhance student success
- The Academic Audit must be conducted by a team of 2-4 members trained on the use of the rubrics. Tennessee Board of Regents will coordinate the process of training individuals on the use of the Academic Audit Rubric. Audit Team members must complete the appropriate Academic Audit Rubric by degree designation. See Appendix H and I.
- Reporting
 - For each non-accreditable program evaluated through Academic Audit, the following must accompany the institution's Quality Assurance Funding reporting template:
 - Academic Audit Rubric
 - Academic Audit Team's narrative report

Scoring**Non-accreditable Programs (Program Review and Academic Audit)**

- For non-accreditable programs, scores are calculated by averaging all scored criteria for the program being evaluated, excluding those items judged “not applicable.”
- This value is used to generate points for the standard based on the Table 5.
- Scoring will be cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the 2015-20 cycle.

Table 5: Program Review and Academic Audit Scoring Table											
Average	3.0- 2.9	2.8- 2.7	2.6- 2.4	2.3- 2.1	2.0- 1.8	1.7- 1.5	1.4- 1.2	1.1- 0.9	0.8- 0.6	0.5- 0.3	0.2- 0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Website

<https://www.tbr.edu/academics/academic-audit>

References

- Appendix D – Approved Accreditation Agencies
- Appendix E – Program Review Rubric: Certificate and Associate Programs
- Appendix F – Program Review Rubric: Baccalaureate Programs
- Appendix G – Program Review Rubric: Graduate Programs
- Appendix H – Academic Audit Rubric: Undergraduate Programs
- Appendix I – Academic Audit Rubric: Graduate Programs

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Institutional Satisfaction Studies: University

Points 10 points

Purpose This indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of their undergraduate programs as evaluated by surveys of undergraduate students, recent graduates and faculty.

Schedule	Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
	Year 1: 2015-16	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
	Year 2: 2016-17	Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
	Year 3: 2017-18	PEG Alumni Study & NSSE/FSSE Qualitative Analysis Report
	Year 4: 2018-19	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
	Year 5: 2019-20	Comprehensive Satisfaction Study Report

Years 1 & 4 National Survey of Student Engagement

- In Year 1 and Year 4 of the 2015-20 cycle, NSSE will be administered to a representative sample of undergraduate students to explore the perceptions of students regarding the programs, services and environment of the institution.
- Institutions will follow the most recent sampling procedures of NSSE which will determine the number of surveys based on the institution’s fall enrollment.

Scoring

- Universities will be measured based on their performance as compared to their selected peer group. Institutions will select a peer group (six universities within the same Carnegie classification and located in the SREB member states). The selected peer institution must have utilized NSSE in the year the survey is administered or one year prior.
- Scoring will be based on the 47 questions selected from the NSSE Engagement Themes. Questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean among first year students and senior year students within a 0.02 range.

NSSE Engagement Themes	First Year Students	Senior Year Students
Academic Challenge	17 questions	17 questions
<i>Higher Order Learning</i>	<i>4 questions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Reflective & Integrative Learning</i>	<i>7 questions</i>	<i>7 questions</i>
<i>Learning Strategies</i>	<i>3 questions</i>	<i>3 questions</i>
<i>Quantitative Reasoning</i>	<i>3 questions</i>	<i>3 questions</i>
Learning with Peers	8 questions	8 questions
<i>Collaborate Learning</i>	<i>4 questions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Discussions with Diverse Others</i>	<i>4 questions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
Experiences with Faculty	9 questions	9 questions
<i>Student-Faculty interactions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>	<i>5 questions</i>	<i>5 questions</i>
Campus Environment	13 questions	13 questions
<i>Quality of Interactions</i>	<i>5 questions</i>	<i>5 questions</i>
<i>Supportive Environment</i>	<i>8 questions</i>	<i>8 questions</i>
Total Possible Points	47 Points	47 Points

Table 6: NSSE Scoring <i>Year 1: 2015-16 and Year 4: 2018-19</i>											
# of questions at or above mean	94-85	84-73	72-63	62-53	52-43	42-33	32-23	22-13	12-3	2-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Year 2

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

- In Year 2 of the 2015-20 cycle, FSSE will be administered to a representative sample of faculty to explore faculty perceptions of student engagement and assess faculty teaching practices as it relates to the NSSE engagement themes.
- Institutions will follow the most recent sampling procedures of FSSE and provide the names and e-mail addresses of the selected sample of faculty who will teach at least one undergraduate course in the academic year of administration.

Scoring

- Universities will be measured based on their performance compared to their selected peer group. Institutions will select a peer group (six universities within the same Carnegie classification and located in the SREB member states). The selected peer institution must have utilized FSSE in the year the survey is administered or one year prior.
- Scoring will be based on the 51 questions selected from the FSSE Engagement Themes. Up to 51 points can be earned for each question on which an institution scores at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range.

FSSE Engagement Themes	
Academic Challenge	17 questions
<i>Higher Order Learning</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Reflective & Integrative Learning</i>	<i>7 questions</i>
<i>Learning Strategies</i>	<i>3 questions</i>
<i>Quantitative Reasoning</i>	<i>3 questions</i>
Learning with Peers	8 questions
<i>Collaborate Learning</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Discussions with Diverse Others</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
Experiences with Faculty	12 questions
<i>Student-Faculty interactions</i>	<i>4 questions</i>
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>	<i>8 questions</i>
Campus Environment	14 questions
<i>Quality of Interactions</i>	<i>5 questions</i>
<i>Supportive Environment</i>	<i>9 questions</i>
Total Possible Points	51 points

Table 7: FSSE Scoring <i>Year 2: 2016-17</i>											
# of questions at or above mean	51-47	46-42	41-37	36-32	31-27	26-22	21-17	16-12	11-7	6-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Year 3

PEG Alumni Attitude Survey

- The PEG Alumni Attitude Survey will be administered to all alumni to explore the perceptions of alumni regarding the programs, services and environment at the university. During 2016-17, THEC staff will work with institutions and PEG staff to develop a common alumni survey, establish survey administration guidelines and QAF scoring table. Scoring for the Alumni Attitude Survey will be based on a maximum of seven points.

NSSE/FSSE Qualitative Analysis

- In Year 3 of the 2015-20 cycle, universities will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report of the Year 1 NSSE and Year 2 FSSE results based on the combine NSSE/FSSE analysis report.
- The Qualitative Analysis Report should engage the results of both surveys to examine discrepancies in the perceptions and behaviors of students and faculty.

Scoring

- Three of the available 10 points for Year 3 will be awarded based on the institution's Qualitative Analysis Report of the NSSE/FSSE combined report.
- Whole points will be given for acceptable analysis of each focus question from the scoring rubric. The Qualitative Analysis Report will be evaluated by THEC staff.

NSSE/FSSE Qualitative Analysis Report Scoring Rubric <i>Year 3: 2017-18</i>	
NSSE/FSSE Focus Questions	Points Possible
1) Using the FSSE-NSSE combined report results, identify any concerns, points of interest, or discrepancies between student behaviors and faculty perceptions/values.	1
2) What are the institution's current priorities as related to their Strategic Plan? What do the NSSE and FSSE results reveal about the priorities, and how might they impact these priorities?	1
3) How might the institution address the differences in responses identified in Question 1? Formulate a plan of action to address concerns and rectify any discrepancies.	1
Points Awarded	3

Year 5

Comprehensive Report

- In Year 5 of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle, universities will submit an Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report which details actions taken based on the results of the institutional satisfaction surveys administered in years 1 through 4 of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle.

Scoring

- Reports will be assigned from 0 to 10 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC staff using the criteria outlined in the Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report Rubric (Appendix J).

Comprehensive Report Criterion	Points Possible
Design and Administration	1
Data Analysis	3
Plan of Action	3
Outcomes	2
Continuous Improvement	1
TOTAL	10

Appendix

Appendix J – Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report

Websites

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) <http://nsse.indiana.edu/>
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) <http://fsse.indiana.edu/>
- PEG Alumni Attitude Study (PEG) <http://alumniattitudestudy.org/>

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Institutional Satisfaction Studies: Community College

Points 10 points

Purpose This indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of their undergraduate programs as evaluated by surveys of students at different points in their academic career.

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2015-16	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)
Year 2: 2016-17	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 3: 2017-18	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) and SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Analysis Report
Year 4: 2018-19	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 5: 2019-20	Comprehensive Satisfaction Study Report

Years 1 & 3 Survey of Entering Student Engagement

- In Year 1 and Year 3 of the 2015-20 cycle, SENSE will be administered to explore the perceptions of entering students regarding programs, services and environment of the institution.
- SENSE will be administered during the early weeks of the fall academic term to students in courses randomly selected by the Center for Community College Student Engagement from those most likely to enroll entering students.

Scoring

- Community colleges will be evaluated based on their performance compared to their peers. Peers are determined by institutional enrollment size during the administration term. The Center for Community College Student Engagement determines peer enrollment comparisons based on the following categories:
 - Small colleges (fewer than 4,499 students)
 - Medium colleges (4,500 – 7,999 students)
 - Large colleges (8,000 – 14,999 students)
 - Extra-large colleges (15,000 or more students)
- Scoring will be based on 30 questions selected from the SENSE Engagement Themes. Questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range.

SENSE Engagement Themes	
Early Connections	3 questions
High Expectations and Aspirations	1 question
Clear Academic Plan and Pathway	4 questions
Effective Track to College Readiness	3 questions
Engaged Learning	16 questions
Academic and Social Support Network	3 questions
TOTAL	30 questions

Table: 8 SENSE Scoring <i>Year 1: 2015-16</i>											
# of questions at or above mean	30-28	27-25	24-22	21-19	18-16	15-13	12-10	9-7	6-4	3-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 9: SENSE Scoring Table <i>Year 3: 2017-18*</i>								
# of questions at or above mean	30-27	26-23	22-19	18-14	13-9	8-4	3-1	0
Points Awarded	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

**Three points from the possible 10 in Year 3 will be awarded based on the institution's Qualitative Analysis Reports of Year 1 SENSE and Year 2 CCSSE.*

Years 2 & 4 Community College Survey of Student Engagement

- In Year 2 of the 2015-20 cycle, CCSSE will be administered to a representative sample of undergraduate students to explore the perceptions of student regarding programs, services and environment of the institution.
- Institutions will administer CCSSE to students in classes randomly selected by the Center. Institutions will follow the most recent sampling procedures of the Center to determine the number of surveys based on the institution's fall enrollment.

Scoring

- Community colleges will be evaluated based on their performance compared to their peers. Peers are determined by institutional enrollment size during the administration term. The Center for Community College Student Engagement determines peer enrollment comparisons based on the following categories:
 - Small colleges (fewer than 4,499 students)
 - Medium colleges (4,500 – 7,999 students)
 - Large colleges (8,000 – 14,999 students)
 - Extra-large colleges (15,000 or more students)
- Scoring will be based on 38 questions from the CCSSE Engagement Themes.
- Questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range.

CCSSE Engagement Themes	
Active and Collaborative Learning	7 questions
Student Effort	8 questions
Academic Challenge	10 questions
Student-Faculty Interaction	6 questions
Support for Learners	7 questions
Total Possible Points	38 points

Table 10: CCSSE Scoring <i>Year 2: 2016-17 and Year 4: 2018-19</i>											
# of questions at or above mean	38-35	34-31	30-27	26-23	22-19	18-15	14-11	10-7	6-3	2-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Year 3 SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Analysis Report

Qualitative Analysis

- In Year 3 of the 2015-20 cycle, community colleges will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report of the Year 1 SENSE and Year 2 CCSSE results.
- The Qualitative Analysis Report should utilize the results of both surveys to examine discrepancies in the perceptions and behaviors of newly enrolled students and all other students on campus.

Scoring

- Three of the available 10 points for Year 3 will be awarded based on the Qualitative Analysis Report of Year 1 SENSE and Year 2 CCSSE results.
- Whole points will be given for acceptable analysis of each focus question from the scoring rubric. The Qualitative Analysis Report will be evaluated by THEC staff.

SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Analysis Report Scoring Rubric <i>Year 3: Year 2017-18</i>	
SENSE/CCSSE Focus Questions	Points Possible
1) Using the SENSE and CCSSE report results, identify any concerns, points of interest, or discrepancies between perceptions/values of entering students (SENSE) and other students (CCSSE).	1
2) What are the institution’s current priorities as related to their Strategic Plan? What do the SENSE and CCSSE results reveal about the priorities, and how might they impact these priorities?	1
3) How might the institution address the differences in responses between entering students (SENSE) and other students (CCSSE)? Formulate a plan of action to address concerns and rectify any discrepancies.	1
Points Awarded	3

Year 5 Comprehensive Report

- In Year 5 of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle, community colleges will submit an Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report which details actions taken based on the results of the institutional satisfaction surveys administered in years 1 through 4 of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle.

Scoring

- Reports will be assigned from 0 to 10 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC staff using the criteria outlined in the Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report Rubric (Appendix J).

Comprehensive Report Criterion	Points Possible
Design and Administration	1
Data Analysis	3
Plan of Action	3
Outcomes	2
Continuous Improvement	1
TOTAL	10

Appendix

Appendix J – Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report

Websites

- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) <http://www.ccsse.org/sense/>
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) <http://www.ccsse.org/>

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Adult Learner Success

Points	10 points
Purpose	This standard is designed to incentivize institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively improve services for adult learners. This standard directs institutions to enhance the quality of adult student services in effort to increase the enrollment, retention and completion of adult learners at the institution.
Evaluation	Through an institutional self-assessment and engagement with adult students, institutions will create a plan to address strengths and areas needing improvement in order to develop measureable and achievable objectives to improve the services and experiences of adult students and increase adult student success. Institutions will also be evaluated on their success in improving retention and completion rates for adult learners.
Process	<p>Qualitative Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Through self-assessment and engagement with adult students, institutions will develop a strategy to address strengths and areas needing improvement. Each year of the 2015-20 cycle, will challenge institutions to build on previous efforts to address the particular need of adult students.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 2015-16: Self-Assessment<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Institutions will submit a Self-Assessment that includes the current state of adult learner access and success including baseline quantitative and qualitative measures.▪ Institutions will conduct a survey among the adult learner population and utilize the results of the survey to assess student perceptions of the campus environment and services.○ 2016-17: Action Plan<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Institutions will submit a strategic Action Plan that seeks to improve the quality of adult learner services and experiences and increase the quantity of adult graduates.○ 2017-18 and 2018-19: Status Report<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Institutions will submit a progress report that includes all elements of the Action Plan in order to assess the implementation status of each of the Action Plan objectives.○ 2019-20: Comprehensive Report<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Institutions will submit a comprehensive report that includes an evaluation of the implementation status for each Action Plan objective. Institutions will also reflect upon lessons learned from the process, and suggest best practices for next cycle. <p>Quantitative Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Institutions will also focus on the adult graduation rate and the fall to fall retention rate. Institutions should work to ensure that adult student success continues to increase through rising rates of retention and completion.
Scoring	A total of 10 points are available each year through the Adult Learner Success standard. Each year, institutions will be scored on the qualitative and quantitative elements detailed below.

Adult Learner Success Scoring Indicators				
Year	Qualitative Indicators		Quantitative Indicators	
2015-16	Self-Assessment	7 points	Graduates	3 points
2016-17	Action Plan	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2017-18	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2018-19	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2019-20	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points

Qualitative Indicators Scoring

- Progress toward improving success of adult learners will be evaluated by THEC staff using scoring rubrics to distribute Quality Assurance Funding points. See Appendix K for scoring rubrics for each year.

Quantitative Indicators Scoring

- Progress toward improving success of adult learners will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average with the attainment in that year for both retention and completion rates.
- The retention and completion percent attainment will be compared to Table 11 to award points for the retention and completion rates.

Table 11: Adult Learner Success Scoring Graduates and Retention Rates				
Goal Attainment	100% - 91%	90% - 81%	80% - 50%	Below 50%
Points	3	2	1	0

Reference Appendix K – Adult Learner Success Scoring Rubrics

Quality of Student Learning Environment and Engagement

Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement

- Points** 10 points (community colleges only)
- Purpose** The Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement standard is designed to provide incentives for community colleges to continue to improve job placement of graduates.
- Evaluation**
- The Tennessee Longitudinal Data System (TLDS) will be used for statewide job placement analysis that is uniform across all community colleges. The Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement standard will utilize data from TLDS which combines data from the Tennessee Department of Education, Tennessee Department of Labor and THEC tracks employment in Tennessee.
 - Data for graduates during an academic year (summer, fall and spring) will be used to calculate the Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement rate.
 - All certificate and associate degrees will be included with the exception of transfer programs.
 - Transfer programs include: University Parallel, Professional Studies (RODP) and academic certificate programs are not included.
 - The Tennessee Job Market consists of individuals employed full time and those approved for an unemployment insurance claim in Tennessee within four quarter of graduation.
 - Graduates have four quarters from graduation to find full time employment in order to be considered placed.

Cycle Year	Graduates Included in Analysis
Year 1: 2015-16	Summer 2013, Fall 2013 and Spring 2014
Year 2: 2016-17	Summer 2014, Fall 2014 and Spring 2015
Year 3: 2017-18	Summer 2015, Fall 2015 and Spring 2016
Year 4: 2018-19	Summer 2016, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017
Year 5: 2019-20	Summer 2017, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018

- Scoring** **Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement Rate Calculation**
- The placement rate is calculated by dividing the total number of graduates working full time in any of the four quarters after graduation by the total number of graduates in the Tennessee Job Market.
 - The Tennessee Job Market consists of graduates employed full-time in Tennessee and those approved for an unemployment insurance claim in Tennessee.
 - Scoring will be based on the overall placement rate for the community college. This placement ratio will be compared to Table 12 to award points on this standard.

Table 12: Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement Scoring Table											
Placement Rate	100% - 97%	96% - 93%	92% - 89%	88% - 85%	84% - 81%	80% - 77%	76% - 73%	72% - 69%	68% - 65%	64% - 61%	> 61%
Points	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

- References** • Appendix L - Tennessee Job Market Placement Trends

Quality of Student Access and Success

Focus Populations

Points	25 points
Purpose	The Student Access and Success standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to increase the number of graduates from select focus populations.
Evaluation	An institution will select those focus populations particularly important to the institution's mission and will measure the quality of services dedicated to those students. The measure of the institutional success will be an increase in the focus population graduation rate.
Process	<p>Selection of Focus Populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The available focus populations include those individually identified by institutions as critical to their institutional mission and service area. Institutions will select a total of five focus populations from the following 12 options:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Demographics<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ African Americans▪ High Need Geographic Area▪ Hispanics▪ Low-Income▪ Males▪ Veterans▪ Graduate Degrees: African American, Hispanic or STEM○ Academic Programs<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Health Programs▪ Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Programs○ Transfer<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Associate Degree Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities (<i>community colleges only</i>)▪ Baccalaureate Degree Graduates with Previously Earned Associate Degree (<i>universities only</i>)○ Other<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Institutional Selection• The deadline for submission of selected focus populations is September 1, 2015. Selections must be approved by THEC staff.• The Focus Population Selection Form, definitions and data sources can be found in Appendix M.
Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Progress toward improving success of focus populations will be evaluated by comparing the three-year number of graduates rolling average with the attainment in that year.• This ratio is derived by dividing the attainment figure by the three year average No attainment may exceed 100 percent. The resulting percent attainment will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage and compared to Table 11 to award points for this indicator.• Points will be summed for all five focus populations with a 25 point maximum.

Table 13: Focus Populations Scoring Table						
Percent Attainment	100% - 99%	98% - 95%	94% - 90%	89% - 85%	84% - 80%	Below 80%
Points	5	4	3	2	1	0

- Reference**
- Appendix M –Focus Populations Selection Form

**2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Appendices**



Appendix A – General Education Assessment Selection Form23

Appendix B – Approved Major Field Tests.....25

Appendix C – Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Plan.....28

Appendix D – Approved Accreditation Agencies.....30

Appendix E – Program Review Rubric: Certificate and Associate Programs.....33

Appendix F – Program Review Rubric: Baccalaureate Programs.....36

Appendix G – Program Review Rubric: Graduate Programs.....39

Appendix H – Academic Audit Rubric: Undergraduate Programs.....42

Appendix I – Academic Audit Rubric: Graduate Programs.....46

Appendix J –Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report50

Appendix K – Adult Learner Success Scoring Rubrics.....53

Appendix L – TN Job Market Placement Trends.....58

Appendix M – Focus Populations Selection Form61

Appendix A
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
General Education Assessment Selection Form



Institution: _____

This form should be used to select the general education assessment and indicate if sampling will be used for the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle.

Test Selection

- [California Critical Thinking Skills Test](#) (CCTST)

Delivery Method

- On line
- Traditional paper and pencil

- [ETS Proficiency Profile](#)

Delivery Method

- On line
- Traditional paper and pencil

Test Length

- Standard (2 hours)
- Abbreviated (40 minutes)

Population or Sample Selection

- Test entire graduating student population (summer, fall and spring)
- Test representative sample of the graduating student population

Any institution requesting to use sampling must meet a minimum threshold of a 95% confidence level with a margin of error of 3. In addition, an institution must also submit a **Sampling Plan** that includes an explanation of how graduates are selected for sampling across the institution.

Institution	Graduates *	Sample Required	Percent of Graduates
Austin Peay	1,424	610	43%
East Tennessee	2,260	725	32%
Middle Tennessee	4,027	844	21%
Tennessee State	903	489	54%
Tennessee Tech	1,777	667	38%
Univ of Memphis	2,867	778	27%
UT Chattanooga	1,636	646	39%
UT Knoxville	4,439	860	19%
UT Martin	1,195	564	47%

Institution	Graduates *	Sample Required	Percent of Graduates
Chattanooga	981	511	52%
Cleveland	396	289	73%
Columbia	612	389	64%
Dyersburg	302	236	78%
Jackson	511	346	68%
Motlow	599	384	64%
Nashville	663	409	62%
Northeast	755	442	59%
Pellissippi	1,215	568	47%
Roane	796	456	57%
Southwest	848	473	56%
Volunteer	772	448	58%
Walters	832	468	56%

If during the 2015-20 cycle, there is a considerable change in the number of graduates, an institution can request a modification to the percent of graduates required for testing.

** Source: Graduate projections are based on degrees awarded in 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 as reported in the THEC Factbook.*

Appendix B
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Approved Major Field Tests

Assessments Used for Various Academic Programs

THEC Code	Assessment	Subjects
1	Local Test	
2	Cooperative Test	
4	Educational Testing Service Major Field Test (MFT)	1. Biology 2. Business 3. Chemistry 4. Computer Science 5. Criminal Justice 6. Economics 7. Literature in English 8. Mathematics 9. Music 10. Physics 11. Political Science 12. Psychology 13. Sociology
52	Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT)	1. Agriculture* 2. Biology 3. Business* 4. Communication 5. Criminal Justice* 6. Geology 7. History 8. Literature in English 9. Political Science 10. Psychology 11. Social Work

**Available for use by community colleges.*

Major Field Assessments by Licensure Programs

Academic Program	THEC Code	Assessment
Engineering	5	National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES)
Engineering	39	Society of Manufacturing Engineering Technical Certification Test
Dental Assisting	15	Dental Assisting National Board Certified Dental Assistant
Dental Hygiene	42	Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations National Board Dental Hygiene Examination
Health Information	37	American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA)
Human Services	10	Center for Credentialing and Education Human Services Board Certified Practitioner
Medical Laboratory Technology	41	American Medical Technologies Medical Laboratory Technologist Certification
Medical Laboratory Technology	66	American Society for Clinical Pathology
Nursing	29	National Council of State Boards of Nursing
Occupational Therapy	33	National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant (COTA) Exam
Occupational Therapy	44	National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy Occupational Therapists Registered (OTR) Exam
Ophthalmic Technician	70	Joint Commission on Allied Health Personnel in Ophthalmology Certified Ophthalmic Technician
Opticianry	62	American Board of Opticianry National Opticianry Competency Examination
Physical Therapy	34	Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy National Physical Therapy Examination
Radiology	36	American Society of Radiologic Technologists American Registry of Radiologic Technologist Examination
Respiratory Care	38	National Board of Respiratory Care Certified Respiratory Therapist (CRT)
Respiratory Care	46	National Board for Respiratory Care Registered Respiratory Therapist (RRT)
Surgical Technology	43	National Board of Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting
Teacher Education	71	Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity edTPA
Teacher Education	31	Education Testing Service Praxis Series
Veterinary Technology	53	American Association of Veterinary State Boards Veterinary Technician National Examination

Major Field Assessments by Academic Program

Academic Program	THEC Code	Assessment
Accounting	3	Accreditation Council for Accountancy and Taxation (ACAT)
Administrative Assistant and Secretarial Science	47	Office Proficiency Assessment Certification (OPAC)
Architecture	55	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards Architectural Registration Examination
Automotive Technology	57	National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence
Business	14	Peregrine Academic Services Business Administration Exam
Chemistry	9	American Chemical Society Examination
Computer and Information Sciences	48	Institute of Certification of Computer Professionals Examination
Computer Science and Information Technology	49	Brainbench
Computing Technology	65	Computing Technology Industry Association Certification Exam
Dietetics	69	Commission on Dietetic Registration American Dietetics Exam
Emergency Medicine	35	National Registry of Emergency Medicine Technicians Examination
Engineering Technology	20	National Occupational Competency Testing Institute
Engineering Technology	32	National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies
Industrial Technology	64	Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering
Information Systems Technology	12	CompTIA A+ Certification
Information Systems Technology	13	Microsoft Office Specialist Certification Exam
Mechatronic Technology	61	Seimens Mechatronics System Exam
Office Administration	19	International Association of Administrative Professionals Certified Professional Secretary Examination
Soil Science	67	Soil Science Society of America
Sports Medicine	68	American College of Sports Medicine

Appendix C
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Plan



Departments are given the opportunity to select the most appropriate assessment tool for fulfilling the Major Field Assessment standard. Each department should select the assessment that best supports the learning objectives of the discipline. Assessments typically fall into two broad categories: standardized tests (including licensure exams) and locally developed tests.

- Standardized tests offer the advantage of minimal time commitment with regard to test development and access to nationally normed data regarding student performance.
- Locally developed tests allow assessments to directly relate to curricula but require a significant time dedication to create and maintain. Departments may create a test or use a capstone course or culminating project as the major field test.

If a department chooses to use a locally developed assessment tool, or if alterations of a previously existing locally develop test exceed 20 percent, the department must:

- Submit completed *Local Test Development Plan* form to THEC for approval
- Secure reviews of the *Plan* form and assessment from two consultants outside the institution
- Pilot assessment for comparison during the Planning Year
- Provide campus coordinator with the following:
 - Completed *Plan* form
 - Curriculum vitae of each consultant
 - All correspondence to and from the consultants related to the review
 - Finalized assessment
 - Scores from the pilot test, baseline, and official reporting year.

For the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle, the development of a local test will consist of a three year process: planning year, baseline year, and reporting year.

1st Year: Planning Year	
<i>Summer/Fall Semesters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete the <i>Plan</i> form and submit to THEC ▪ Create assessment ▪ Secure institutional staff/2 external consultants to review <i>Plan</i> form and assessment ▪ Send copies of all materials to campus coordinator
<i>Spring Semester</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make adjustments to assessment ▪ Pilot administration
2nd Year: Baseline Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms using the new test. Test results will serve as a baseline for comparison in the reporting/testing year.
3rd Year: Reporting Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms ▪ Institution must report both baseline year and reporting year data for scoring.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
 Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Plan



Institution: _____

Academic Program: _____

Check one box to note 3 year process (planning year, baseline year, and reporting year)

- Planning Year 2015-16, Baseline 2016-17, and Reporting Year 2016-17
- Planning Year 2016-17, Baseline 2017-18, and Reporting Year 2018-19
- Planning Year 2017-18, Baseline 2018-19, and Reporting Year 2019-20

Responsible Parties (i.e., Department Head, Faculty Contact(s), etc.)

Name	Status (e.g., department head, main contact, cc only, etc.)

What type of assessment is going to suit our needs?

- Multiple choice exam (scoring example: percentage of correct responses)
- Essay/short answer (scoring example: define a rubric and secure evaluators)
- Capstone experience (scoring example: final course/project percentage)
- Other (explain test type and scoring)

What Student Learning Outcomes will this assessment address?

What steps need to be taken to construct this assessment?

Timeline	Action

Who will review this assessment?

Name	Credentials

What is the plan for piloting this assessment? (proposed test dates, how to use results, who will be given the pilot test, etc.)

Timeline	Action

Appendix D
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Approved Accreditation Agencies

Discipline	Acronym	Accrediting Agency
Allied Health	<u>CAAHEP</u>	Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs ¹
Architecture	<u>NAAB</u>	National Architectural Accrediting Board
Art and Design	<u>NASAD</u>	National Association of Schools of Art and Design
Athletic Training	<u>CAATE</u>	Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education
Audiology/Speech-Language Pathology	<u>ASHA</u>	American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Aviation	<u>AABI</u>	Aviation Accreditation Board International
Business	<u>ACBSP</u>	Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs ²
Business	<u>AACSB</u>	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business ³
Chemistry	<u>ACS</u>	American Chemical Society
Clinical Laboratory Sciences	<u>NAACLS</u>	National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences
Clinical Pastoral Education	<u>ACPEAC</u>	Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc. – Accreditation Commission
Counseling	<u>ACA</u>	American Counseling Association
Culinary	<u>ACF</u>	American Culinary Federation
Dentistry	<u>ADA</u>	American Dental Association
Dietetics	<u>AND</u>	Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics
Engineering (Applied Science, Computing and Technology)	<u>ABET</u>	Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology
Environmental Health Science	<u>NEHA</u>	National Environmental Health Association
Family and Consumer Sciences	<u>AAFCS</u>	American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences
Forestry	<u>SAF</u>	Society of American Foresters
Health Administration	<u>AUPHA</u>	Association of University Programs in Health Administration
Health Information	<u>CAHIIM</u>	Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education

Discipline	Acronym	Accrediting Agency
Industrial Technology	ATMAE	Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering
Interior Design	CIDA	Council for Interior Design Accreditation
Journalism and Mass Communication	ACEJMC	Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications
Landscape Architecture	ASLA	American Society of Landscape Architects
Law and Legal Studies	ABA	American Bar Association
Library and Information Studies	ALA	American Library Association
Massage Therapy	COMTA	Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation
Medical Education	LCME	Liaison Committee on Medical Education
Music	NASM	National Association of Schools of Music
Nurse Anesthetists	AANA	American Association of Nurse Anesthetists
Nursing	ACEN	Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing ⁴
Nursing	AACN	American Association of Colleges of Nursing ⁵
Occupational Therapy	AOTA	American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.
Ophthalmic	JCAHPO	Joint Commission on Allied Health Personnel in Ophthalmology
Optician	COA	Commission on Opticianry Accreditation
Pharmacy	ACPE	Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education
Pharmacy Technician	ASHP	American Society of Health - System Pharmacists
Physical Therapy	APTA	American Physical Therapy Association
Planning	ACSP	Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
Psychology	APA	American Psychological Association
Public Affairs and Administration	NASPAA	National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
Public Health	CEPH	Council on Education for Public Health
Radiologic Technology	JRCERT	Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology
Recreation and Parks	NRPA	National Recreation and Park Association

Discipline	Acronym	Accrediting Agency
Rehabilitation Counseling	CORE	Council on Rehabilitation Education
Respiratory Care	COARC	Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care
Social Work Education	CSWE	Council on Social Work Education
Teacher Education	CAEP	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Teacher Education Early Childhood	NAEYC	National Association for the Education of the Young Child
Theatre	NAST	National Association of Schools of Theatre
Veterinary Medicine	AVMA	American Veterinary Medical Association

Footnotes

1. CAAHEP has multiple Committees on Accreditation that review and accredit education program in 25 health science occupations. These committees review programs in their specific professional areas and formulate accreditation recommendations which are considered by CAAHEP.

Advanced Cardiovascular Sonography	Exercise Physiology	Orthotics and Prosthetics
Anesthesia Technologist/Technician	Exercise Science	Perfusion
Anesthesiologist Assistant	Kinesiotherapy	Personal Fitness Trainer
Blood Banking	Lactation Consultant	Polysomnography
Cardiovascular Technology	Medical Assistant	Recreational Therapist
Clinical Research Professional	Medical Illustrator	Surgical Assistant
Cytotechnology	Medical Scribe Specialist	Surgical Technology
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	Neurodiagnostic Technology	
Emergency Medical Services Professional	Orthotic and Prosthetic Technical	

2. Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) accredits business, accounting and business-related programs at the associate, baccalaureate and graduate levels.
3. Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accredits business and accounting programs at the baccalaureate and graduate levels.
4. Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) accredits nursing programs at the practical, pre-baccalaureate, baccalaureate and graduate levels.
5. American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) accredits nursing programs at the baccalaureate and graduate levels.

Appendix E
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Certificate and Associate Programs



Institution:	
Program Title:	
CIP Code:	
Embedded Certificates:	
Embedded Certificates:	
Embedded Certificates:	

Instruction for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable certificate and associate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle. If the program under review contains embedded Technical Certificates, the names of each certificate should be included above. The review of embedded certificates must be included as part of the review of the program in which they are embedded. Embedded certificates do not require a separate *Program Review Rubric*.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following *Program Review Rubric*. The *Program Review Rubric* lists 30 criteria grouped into seven categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points to certificate and associate programs. The five 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 community college's budget.

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s)

Name	_____	Name	_____
Title	_____	Title	_____
Institution	_____	Institution	_____
Signature	_____	Signature	_____
Date	_____	Date	_____

Program Review Rubric Certificate and Associate 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 indicators to evaluate achievement of program and student learning outcomes.					
1.3	The program makes uses 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 the results are used for curriculum 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 is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program.					
3. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
3.1	The program provides students with the opportunity to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.					
3.2	The program provides students with the opportunity to regularly evaluate faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					
3.3	The program ensures students are exposed to professional and career opportunities appropriate to the field.					
3.4	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.					
4.3	The program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					
4.4	The faculty engage in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship, and practice.					
4.5	The faculty are 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. Economic Development		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
6.1	For transfer programs: The program provides and promotes clear transfer pathways supported by curricular maps, advising and other means to support student articulation.					
6.2*	For transfer programs: Graduates who transfer to baccalaureate programs in a related area are successful.					
6.3	For career programs: The program demonstrates responsiveness to local and regional workforce needs through an advisory committee, partnerships with industry and/or other means.					
6.4	For career programs: The program identifies applicable workforce trends and uses the information to improve the program.					
7. Support		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
7.1*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.					
7.2*	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					

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

Appendix F
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Baccalaureate Programs



Institution:
Program Title:
CIP Code:

Instruction for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2015-20 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.*

Appendix G
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Graduate Programs



Institution:	
Program Title:	
CIP Code:	Degree Designation:

Instruction for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following *Program Review Rubric*. The *Program Review Rubric* lists 32 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points in to graduate 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 Graduate 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 is reviewed regularly and the 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 reflects progressively more advanced in academic content than its related undergraduate programs.					
2.4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program and student learning outcomes identified in 1.1.					
2.5	The curriculum is structured to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline.					
2.6	The curriculum strives to offer ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.					
2.7	Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure achievement of program outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.					
2.8	The program incorporates appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations that advance student learning into the curriculum.					
3. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
3.1	The program ensures a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.					
3.2	The program provides students with the opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					
3.3	The program provides adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication.					
3.4	The program provides adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.					

3.5	The program seeks to include diverse perspectives and experiences through curricular and extracurricular activities.					
3.6	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.					
4. Faculty		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 teaching loads are aligned with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.					
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 faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship and practice.					
4.5	The faculty is actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success.					
4.6	The program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					
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.					
5.3	The program provides adequate materials and support staff to encourage research and publication.					
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.					
6.4	The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.					
6.5	The program's procedures are regularly reviewed to ensure alignment to institutional policies and mission.					

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

Appendix H
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Academic Audit: Undergraduate Programs



Institution:		
Program Title:		
CIP Code:		
Embedded Certificates:		
Academic Audit Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> First Academic Audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Academic Audit

Instruction for Academic Audit Team

In accordance with the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable undergraduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle. If the program under review contains embedded Technical Certificates, the names of each certificate should be included above. The review of embedded certificates must be included as part of the program audit in which they are embedded. Embedded certificates do not require a separate *Academic Audit Rubric*.

The criteria used to evaluate an undergraduate program appear in the following *Academic Audit Rubric*. The *Academic Audit Rubric* lists 25 criteria grouped into seven standards. Criteria in standards 1-6 will be used to assess standards and distribute points to undergraduate programs utilizing the Academic Audit for the first time. For programs undergoing a follow-up Academic Audit, criteria 7 will also be used to assess standards and distribute points. The three criteria noted with an asterisk are excluded from the point calculation but will be used by the institution in their overall assessment.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a *Self Study*. Supporting documents will be available for review as specified in the *Self Study*. As an Academic Audit Team Leader, you should evaluate this evidence and any other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether the criterion is not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed in the program. If a particular criterion is inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked NA.

The rubric will be shared with the department, college and central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. When combined with the written report prepared by the Academic Audit Team, the *Academic Audit Rubric* will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria will be used in allocating state funds for the institution’s budget.

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Audit Team Leaders

Name	_____	Name	_____
Title	_____	Title	_____
Institution	_____	Institution	_____
Signature	_____	Signature	_____
Date	_____	Date	_____

Academic Audit Rubric Undergraduate Programs

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

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

3.4	The faculty analyze evaluation results on a regular basis and modify teaching methods to improve student learning.					
3.5	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances its teaching, scholarship and practice.					
3.6	The program monitors student persistence and success in its courses and program and uses that data to inform improvements in the program and to optimize student success.					
4. Student Learning Assessment		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
4.1	The faculty uses indicators of student learning success that are aligned with program and student learning outcomes.					
4.2	The faculty assesses student learning at multiple points throughout the program using a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.					
4.3	The program regularly implements continuous quality improvements based upon the results of its student learning assessments.					
5. Support		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
5.1*	The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.					
5.2*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.					
5.3*	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					
6. Academic Audit Process		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
6.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.					
6.2	The Academic Audit process (Self Study and site visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes.					
6.3	The Academic Audit process resulted in a thorough description of program strengths and program weaknesses as well as a prioritized list of initiatives for improvement.					
6.4	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from appropriate stakeholder groups.					

7. Follow-up of Previous Audit		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
7.1	There is documented evidence that the program has implemented the plans for its initiatives for improvement cited by the faculty in the previous self-study report including any changes to those initiatives for improvement.					
7.2	There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Auditor Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.					

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

Appendix I
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Academic Audit: Graduate Programs



Institution:		
Program Title:		
CIP Code:		
Academic Audit Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> First Academic Audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Academic Audit

Instruction for Academic Audit Team

In accordance with the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a graduate program appear in the following *Academic Audit Rubric*. The *Academic Audit Rubric* lists 38 criteria grouped into eight standards. Criteria in standards 1-7 will be used to assess standards and distribute points to graduate programs utilizing the Academic Audit for the first time. Programs undergoing a follow-up Academic Audit, criteria 8 will also be used to assess standards and distribute points. The three criteria noted with an asterisk are excluded from the point calculation but will be used by the institution in their overall assessment.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a Self Study. Supporting documents will be available for review as specified in the Self Study. As an Academic Audit Team Leader, you should evaluate this evidence and any other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether the criterion is not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed in the program. If a particular criterion is inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked NA.

The rubric will be shared with the department, college and central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. When combined with the written report prepared by the Academic Audit Team, the Academic Audit Rubric will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria will be used in allocating state funds for the institution’s budget.

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Audit Team Leaders

Name	_____	Name	_____
Title	_____	Title	_____
Institution	_____	Institution	_____
Signature	_____	Signature	_____
Date	_____	Date	_____

Academic Audit Rubric Graduate Programs

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

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

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

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

* Criteria not scored as part of Quality Assurance Funding.

Appendix J
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report



During the final year of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle, institutions will submit an Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report with details actions taken based on the results of the institutional satisfaction surveys administered in years 1 through 4 of the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle. The Comprehensive Report will provide evidence of the usage of the satisfaction surveys for institutional planning and improvement. Report should not exceed 10 pages, excluding appendices.

Cycle Year	University	Community College
Year 1 – 2015-16	NSSE Survey	SENSE Survey
Year 2 – 2016-17	FSSE Survey	CCSSE Survey
Year 3 – 2017-18	Alumni Survey	SENSE Survey
Year 4 – 2018-19	NSSE Survey	CCSSE Survey

Scoring

Reports will be assigned from 0 to 10 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The Commission staff will evaluate the reports and assign points according to the scoring criteria identified below.

Criterion: Design and Administration	
<i>The design and administration criterion seeks to engage universities in examining the instruments and methodology of the satisfaction surveys and how information derived from the surveys contributes to a productive institutional environment.</i>	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of satisfaction surveys and how survey feedback influences the understanding of the campus environment and overall satisfaction • Explanation of the design and administration of surveys including scheduling, sampling methodology, response rates and how they may influence survey results 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information regarding surveys that lacks a clear vision for how feedback can be used to evaluate the campus environment and overall satisfaction • Minimal information regarding the design and administration of surveys 	0

Criterion: Data Analysis	
<i>The data analysis criterion seeks to engage colleges and universities in a review of survey data and assist in identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses, as well as areas for institutional improvement.</i>	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed analysis of survey data and findings including trends, discrepancies in student, faculty and alumni perspectives, results of the NSSE-FSSE combined report, peer comparisons, etc. • Thorough discussion of strengths and weaknesses revealed through data analysis • Clear rationale for the identification of institutional strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement 	3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis of survey data and findings • Adequate discussion of strengths and weaknesses revealed through data analysis • Limited rationale for the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and areas for institutional improvement 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited analysis of survey data and findings • Discussion of strengths and weaknesses that lacks depth • Minimal rationale for the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and areas for institutional improvement 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak analysis of survey data and findings • Insufficient discussion of strengths and weaknesses • Inadequate rationale for the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and areas for institutional improvement 	0

Criterion: Plan of Action	
<i>The plan of action criterion seeks to engage colleges and universities in developing a strategy for addressing the areas for institutional improvement identified through survey data.</i>	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defines action items and details how these strategies will improve overall satisfaction • Includes timelines for achieving both intermediary and long term goals • Establishes success indicators and descriptions of what evidence will demonstrate progress/success • Universities: Advances the Year 3 Qualitative Analysis Report through inclusion of the Year 3 PEG Alumni Survey and Year 4 NSSE administration • Community Colleges: Advances the Year 3 Qualitative Analysis Report through inclusion of the second administration of the Year 3 SENSE and Year 4 CCSSE administration 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies actions items with adequate detail as to how strategies will improve overall satisfaction • Includes timelines for achieving project goals • Provides success indicators and adequate explanation of what evidence will demonstrate progress/success • Demonstrates limited advancement of the Year 3 Qualitative Analysis Report 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies actions items but lacks sufficient detail as to how strategies will improve satisfaction • Includes timelines for achieving some project goals • Provides success indicators with only minimal explanation of what evidence will demonstrate progress/success • Demonstrates minimal advancement of the Year 3 Qualitative Analysis Report 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes minimal explanation of action items • Lacks sufficient detail regarding timelines • Provides inadequate success indicators • Demonstrates weak advancement of the Year 3 Qualitative Analysis Report 	0

Criterion: Outcomes	
<i>The outcomes criterion seeks to engage community colleges and universities in establishing outcomes and detailing progress made in increasing overall institutional satisfaction.</i>	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of the relationship between the Action Plan, institutional objectives and desired outcomes • Evidence of the extent to which the desired implementation plan objectives and outcomes have been accomplished • Detailed explanation of the rationale for assessment measures utilized to determine the successful accomplishment of objectives 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description of the relationship between the Action Plan, institutional objectives and desired outcomes • Minimal evidence of the extent to which the desired implementation plan objectives and outcomes have been accomplished • Limited explanation of the rationale for assessment measures utilized to determine the successful accomplishment of objectives 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient description of the relationship between the Action Plan, institutional objectives and desired outcomes • Weak evidence of the extent to which the desired implementation plan objectives and outcomes have been accomplished • Inadequate explanation of the rationale for assessment measures utilized to determine the accomplishment of objectives 	0

Criterion: Continuous Improvement	
<i>The continuous improvement criterion seeks to engage community colleges and universities in planning for the continuous use of survey data and findings to enhance the campus environment and overall satisfaction.</i>	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough description of ways in which survey results will be utilized to promote continuous improvement and enhance overall institutional satisfaction 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information regarding the use of survey results for continuous improvement 	0

Appendix K
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Adult Learner Success Standard: Scoring Rubric



This standard is designed to incentivize institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively improve services for adult learners. This standard will encourage institutions to enhance the quality of adult student services in effort to increase the enrollment, retention and completion of adult learners at the institution.

Scoring Rubric for Adult Learner Success Standard

Qualitative Elements Scoring: Through an institutional self-assessment and engagement with adult students, institutions will create an Action Plan to address strengths and areas needing improvement in order to develop measureable and achievable objectives to improve the services and experiences of adult students and increase adult student success. Progress toward improving success of adult learners will be evaluated by THEC staff using scoring rubrics to distribute Quality Assurance points.

Quantitative Elements Scoring: Institutions will also be evaluated on their success in improving retention and completion rates for adult learners. Progress toward improving success of adult learners will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average with the attainment in that year for both retention and completion rates. The percent attainment will be compared to Table 11 to award points for the retention and completion rates.

Table 11				
Goal Attainment	100%-91%	90%-81%	80%-50%	Below 50%
Points	3	2	1	0

Year	Qualitative		Quantitative	
2015-16	Self Assessment	7 points	Graduates	3 points
2016-17	Action Plan	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2017-18	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2018-19	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2019-20	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points

Adult Learner Success Standard: Scoring Rubric

Year 1: Self-Assessment



Scoring

Institutional Self-Assessments will be assigned from 0 to 7 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The Commission staff will evaluate the reports and assign points according to the scoring criteria identified below. The Self-Assessment report should include the current status of adult learners and survey results. The report should not exceed 10 pages, excluding appendices.

Self-Assessment <i>Year 1: 2015-16</i>	
<i>Institutions will submit a Self-Assessment that includes the current state of adult learner access and success including baseline quantitative and qualitative measures.</i>	<i>Points Possible</i> 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive introduction to the campus environment for adult learners that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of how serving adult learners is incorporated into the institution’s unique mission. ○ Explanation of how serving adult learners aligns with the state high education master plan ○ Information on how data regarding adult learner experiences are currently collected and evaluated 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough analysis of baseline quantitative measures including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of adult learners enrolled ○ Adult learner completion rates ○ First year retention rates ○ Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) utilization rates 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth analysis of qualitative measures including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation of the inventory of academic and co-curricular programs and services provided specifically to adult learners ○ Explanation of resources and professional development opportunities provided to staff and faculty to better serve adult learners ○ Status of institutional policy and practice alignment with the Recommended Standards in PLA Policy and Practice for Tennessee Public Colleges and Universities 	1
<i>Institutions will conduct a survey among the adult learner population and utilize the results of the survey to assess student perceptions of the following qualitative measures.</i>	<i>Points Possible</i> 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed explanation of the adult learner survey including design, methodology, and distribution process 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough analysis of adult student perceptions of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ course availability and value ○ campus culture and outreach to adult students ○ institutional support services and resources ○ policies and procedures concerning prior learning assessment ○ quality of coursework and faculty 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insightful examination of survey findings including response rates, trends and institutional strengths and weaknesses 	2

Adult Learner Success Standard: Scoring Rubric
Year 2: Action Plan



Scoring

Action Plans will be assigned from 0 to 4 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The Commission staff will evaluate the reports and assign points according to the scoring criteria identified below. The Action Plan should not exceed 5 pages, excluding appendices.

Action Plan <i>Year 2: 2016-17</i>	
<i>Institutions will submit a strategic Action Plan that seeks to improve the quality of adult learner services and experiences and increase the quantity of adult graduates.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives developed with specific details and informed by the self-assessment and adult learner survey from Year 1 	<i>1</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined success indicators and descriptions of what evidence demonstrates progress/success. 	<i>1</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recruiting, engaging, and graduating adult learners informed by evidenced-based best practices and research ○ Including prior learning into adult learner degree plans ○ Incorporating adult learner survey feedback into current institutional policies and practices ○ Improving the quality of adult student services and experiences ○ Increasing the quantity of adult learner graduates 	<i>2</i>

Adult Learner Success Standard: Scoring Rubric
Years 3 and 4: Implementation Status



Scoring

Implementation Status reports will be assigned from 0 to 4 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The Commission staff will evaluate the reports and assign points according to the scoring criteria identified below. The Implementation Status report should not exceed 5 pages, excluding appendices.

Implementation Status <i>Year 3: 2017-18 and Year 4: 2018-19</i>	
<i>Institutions will submit a progress report that includes all elements of the Year 2 Action Plan in order to assess the implementation status of each of the Action Plan objectives. Year 4 Implementation Status report should build on the Year 3 report.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and thorough progress report on the strategies and plans outlined in the Action Plan to effectively <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recruit, engage, and graduate adult learners informed by evidenced-based best practices and research ○ Include prior learning assessments into adult learner degree plans ○ Incorporate adult learner survey feedback into current institutional policies and practices ○ Improve the quality of adult student services and experiences ○ Increase the quantity of adult learner graduates • Detailed evidence of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory progress report on the strategies and plans outlined in the Action Plan • Sufficient evidence of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate progress report on the strategies and plans outlined in the Action Plan • Moderate evidence of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited progress report on the strategies and plans outlined in the Action Plan • Minimal evidence of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate progress report on the strategies and plans outlined in the Action Plan • Weak evidence of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished 	0

Adult Learner Success Standard: Scoring Rubric
Year 5: Comprehensive Report



Scoring

Comprehensive Reports will be assigned from 0 to 4 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The Commission staff will evaluate the reports and assign points according to the scoring criteria identified below. Comprehensive Reports should not exceed 10 pages, excluding appendices.

Comprehensive Report <i>Year 5: 2019-20</i>	
<p><i>Institutions will submit a comprehensive report that includes an evaluation of the implementation status for each Action Plan objective. Institutions will also reflect upon lessons learned from the process, and suggest best practices for next cycle.</i></p>	<p>Points Possible 4</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed analysis of the extent to which the desired Action Plan objectives have been accomplished that focus on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recruiting, engaging, and graduating adult learners informed by evidenced-based best practices and research ○ Including prior learning into adult learner degree plans ○ Incorporating adult learner survey feedback into current institutional policies and practices ○ Improving the quality of adult student services and experiences • Provide a clear rationale for any Action Plan objectives that were not accomplished 	<p>2</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough reflection on best practices and next steps based upon institutional experience with adult learners 	<p>2</p>

Appendix L
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding

Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement
Academic Year 2010-2011

	A	B	A-B	C	D	E	F	G	H	F+G	G/(F+G)
Institution	Degrees Awarded	UP and PS Deg & Cert	Degrees - UP&PS	Total Graduates	Enrolled in Comm. College	Enrolled in University	UI Claim	Employed Full Time	Employed Part Time	TN Job Market	TN Job Market Employment Rate
Chattanooga	1,168	319	849	771	168	55	26	369	41	395	93%
Cleveland	579	174	405	394	69	16	8	215	43	223	96%
Columbia	593	276	317	317	41	28	5	189	23	194	97%
Dyersburg	298	112	186	172	13	34	5	92	11	97	95%
Jackson	603	211	392	392	33	32	10	273	16	283	96%
Motlow	584	387	197	182	20	52	5	86	4	91	95%
Nashville	716	222	494	474	103	31	14	226	29	240	94%
Northeast	859	380	479	384	78	29	15	194	23	209	93%
Pellissippi	1,440	546	894	744	297	95	24	219	41	243	90%
Roane	904	276	628	616	96	79	13	333	34	346	96%
Southwest	1,278	355	923	861	200	72	18	401	55	419	96%
Volunteer	1,033	433	600	552	100	34	20	309	31	329	94%
Walters	1,061	344	717	705	74	42	25	450	33	475	95%
TOTAL	11,116	4035	7081	6564	1292	599	188	3356	384	3544	95%

Indicator	Definition	Source
Degrees Awarded	Degrees awarded in the academic year as reported by THEC Factbook	SIS
UP and PS Deg & Cert	University Parallel (16.24.0101) and Professional Studies (16.24.0102) Degrees & Certificates	SIS
Degrees - UP&PS	Degrees awarded, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Total Graduates	All graduates, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Enrolled in Comm. College	Graduates enrolled in TN community college	TLDS
Enrolled in University	Graduates enrolled in TBR, UT or TICUA university	TLDS
UI Claim	Graduates approved for an unemployment insurance during any of the four quarters following graduation	TLDS
Employed Full Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
Employed Part Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed less than full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
TN Job Market	Graduates engaged in the Tennessee job market (UI Claim + Employed Full Time)	TLDS
TN Job Market Employment Rate	Graduates employed full time divided by graduates in the TN Job Market	TLDS

**Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement
Academic Year 2011-2012**

	A	B	A-B	C	D	E	F	G	H	F+G	G/(F+G)
Institution	Degrees Awarded	UP and PS Deg & Cert	Degrees - UP&PS	Total Graduates	Enrolled in Comm. College	Enrolled in University	UI Claim	Employed Full Time	Employed Part Time	TN Job Market	TN Job Market Employment Rate
Chattanooga	1,310	355	955	863	140	69	27	462	53	489	94%
Cleveland	877	468	409	390	57	19	17	218	30	235	93%
Columbia	934	524	410	343	32	46	6	208	16	214	97%
Dyersburg	369	151	218	190	14	19	6	113	7	119	95%
Jackson	664	272	392	390	62	31	5	247	17	252	98%
Motlow	647	478	169	169	24	51	2	75	6	77	97%
Nashville	1446	863	583	554	111	51	17	267	31	284	94%
Northeast	993	442	551	435	74	36	10	238	24	248	96%
Pellissippi	4,460	3490	970	827	386	75	30	230	38	260	88%
Roane	912	321	591	571	88	77	8	315	37	323	98%
Southwest	1,306	390	916	871	229	43	16	382	56	398	96%
Volunteer	2,199	1209	990	837	200	46	10	452	56	462	98%
Walters	1,672	743	929	723	87	65	10	448	39	458	98%
TOTAL	17,789	9,706	8,083	7163	1504	628	164	3655	410	3819	96%

Indicator	Definition	Source
Degrees Awarded	Degrees awarded in the academic year as reported by THEC Factbook	SIS
UP and PS Deg & Cert	University Parallel (16.24.0101) and Professional Studies (16.24.0102) Degrees & Certificates	SIS
Degrees - UP&PS	Degrees awarded, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Total Graduates	All graduates, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Enrolled in Comm. College	Graduates enrolled in TN community college	TLDS
Enrolled in University	Graduates enrolled in TBR, UT or TICUA university	TLDS
UI Claim	Graduates approved for an unemployment insurance during any of the four quarters following graduation	TLDS
Employed Full Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
Employed Part Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed less than full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
TN Job Market	Graduates engaged in the Tennessee job market (UI Claim + Employed Full Time)	TLDS
TN Job Market Employment Rate	Graduates employed full time divided by graduates in the TN Job Market	TLDS

Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement
Academic Year 2012-2013

	A	B	A-B	C	D	E	F	G	H	F+G	G/(F+G)
Institution	Degrees Awarded	UP and PS Deg & Cert	Degrees - UP&PS	Total Graduates	Enrolled in Comm. College	Enrolled in University	UI Claim	Employed Full Time	Employed Part Time	TN Job Market	TN Job Market Employment Rate
Chattanooga	1,463	351	1,112	885	151	82	29	425	85	454	94%
Cleveland	1024	587	437	396	68	13	13	196	58	209	94%
Columbia	978	559	419	312	35	43	2	188	23	190	99%
Dyersburg	544	330	214	185	14	23	4	102	23	106	96%
Jackson	642	254	388	385	59	30	8	229	32	237	97%
Motlow	638	430	208	208	32	50	5	97	11	102	95%
Nashville	1267	757	510	480	77	36	9	250	56	259	97%
Northeast	1192	403	789	721	69	32	9	524	38	533	98%
Pellissippi	2,164	1016	1,148	975	446	83	17	284	73	301	94%
Roane	883	349	534	516	67	58	9	285	55	294	97%
Southwest	1,377	464	913	842	196	49	22	345	72	367	94%
Volunteer	1,208	445	763	655	152	34	8	323	77	331	98%
Walters	1,932	1025	907	696	69	65	21	433	62	454	95%
TOTAL	15,312	6,970	8,342	7256	1435	598	156	3681	665	3837	96%

Indicator	Definition	Source
Degrees Awarded	Degrees awarded in the academic year as reported by THEC Factbook	SIS
UP and PS Deg & Cert	University Parallel (16.24.0101) and Professional Studies (16.24.0102) Degrees & Certificates	SIS
Degrees - UP&PS	Degrees awarded, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Total Graduates	All graduates, excluding University Parallel and Professional Studies Degrees and Certificates	SIS
Enrolled in Comm. College	Graduates enrolled in TN community college	TLDS
Enrolled in University	Graduates enrolled in TBR, UT or TICUA university	TLDS
UI Claim	Graduates approved for an unemployment insurance during any of the four quarters following graduation	TLDS
Employed Full Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
Employed Part Time	Graduates with no UI claim and employed less than full time in at least one of the four quarters after graduation	TLDS
TN Job Market	Graduates engaged in the Tennessee job market (UI Claim + Employed Full Time)	TLDS
TN Job Market Employment Rate	Graduates employed full time divided by graduates in the TN Job Market	TLDS

Appendix M
2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Focus Populations Selection Form



The Student Access and Success standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to increase the number of graduates from selected focus populations. An institution will select those focus populations particularly important to the institution’s mission and will measure the quality of its services dedicated to those populations. The measure of the institution’s commitment will be student focus population success – greater number enrolled, retained, and graduated.

This form should be used to select the Student Focus Populations for the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding cycle. Institutions will select 5 of the 12 focus populations from the list below.

Institution:

Check 5 Focus Populations	Focus Populations
	1) Low-Income
	2) African Americans
	3) Hispanics
	4) Males
	5) Veterans ¹
	6) High Need Geographic Area ²
	7) Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Programs
	8) Health Programs
	9) Institutional Selection ³
	10) Associate Degree Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities *
	11) Baccalaureate Degree Graduates with Previously Earned Associate Degree **
	12) Graduate Degrees: African American, Hispanic or STEM (specify which focus population) **

* Community College focus population only

** University focus population only

Notes: Focus Populations

¹Veterans*

Please complete the table below if the **Veterans** focus population has been checked on page 1. The institutional definition of “veterans” and the indicators used to identify an individual as a veteran should be provided.

Institution:					
Focus Population: Veterans	Degrees Awarded				
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Veterans					

** All student focus populations are focused on credential completions of certificates, associate and bachelor's degree only.*

²High Need Geographical Area*

Institutions must make a case for concentrating on a high need county in Tennessee (single or multiple counties). Community colleges should identify their high need geographical area from their respective primary service areas. The [THEC 2015 County Profiles](#) should be used to select the high need geographical area(s).

Please complete the table below if the **High Need Geographical Area** student focus population has been checked on page 1.

Institution:					
Focus Population: High Need Geographical Area(s)	Degrees Awarded				
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14

** All student focus populations are focused on credential completions of certificates, associate and bachelor's degree only.*

3 Institutional Selection

Focus of institutional selection student focus population must be aligned with institutional mission and student population served. Documentation must include justification along with degrees awarded for the period from 2009-10 through 2013-14

Describe student focus population, provide justification for selection and data source(s).

Please complete the table below if the **Institutional Selection** student focus population has been checked on page 1.

Institution:					
Focus Population: Institutional Selection	Degrees Awarded				
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14

** All student focus populations are focused on credential completions of certificates, associate and bachelor's degree only.*