Tennessee Higher Education Commission

Quality Assurance Funding

2020-25 Standards

THEC **TSAC**

State of Tennessee
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation
9th Floor, 312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue
Nashville, TN 37243
(615) 741-3605

July 1, 2020

Tennessee Public Community Colleges and Universities,

At the Tennessee Higher Education Commission meeting on May 15, 2020, the Commission adopted standards to guide the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding (QAF) program. QAF incentivizes institutions to strive for excellence in programmatic and student outcomes while engaging in continuous improvement. The 2020-25 QAF standards are the product of collaboration between institutional, governing board, and THEC staff and serves as the quality check on the Outcomes Based Funding Formula.

The 2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding standards are in line with the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan which sets an ambitious state higher education attainment goal and the 2019 Master Plan update which specifically notes the need for increased attention to advancing equity of outcomes for populations historically underserved by higher education in order to meet our attainment goal.

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission staff will continue to work with all institutions and governing boards as the standards are implemented and institutional progress is evaluated throughout the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding cycle.

Regards,

Mike Krause

cc: Betty Dandridge Johnson
    Victoria Harpool

Agenda Item: II.

DATE: May 15, 2020

SUBJECT: Quality Assurance Funding: 2020-25 Cycle Standards

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

QUALITY ASSURANCE FUNDING OVERVIEW

Tennessee was the first state to utilize quality metrics in state funding; for over 40 years, Quality Assurance Funding (QAF) has provided incentives for all public colleges and universities to measure student learning and institutional effectiveness as part of the continuous improvement process. Institutions may earn an additional 5.45 percent over operating budgets based on performance on metrics particular to their sector and aligned to the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan.

STANDARDS REVIEW PROCESS

Quality Assurance Funding standards are evaluated every five years to ensure alignment with the public agenda and state high education priorities. The QAF Advisory Committee is comprised of governing board and institutional leadership collaborating with THEC staff to revise the standards that are then approved by the Commission. As a result, each five-year cycle has defining features in addition to the common quality standards. For example, 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 allowing QAF to focus solely on quality standards. In alignment with the Drive to 55, the 2015-20 QAF cycle allowed institutions to focus on meeting the needs of adult students to increase student success.

2020-25 QUALITY ASSURANCE FUNDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Mark Byrnes
Provost
Middle Tennessee State University

Dr. Philip Cavalier
Provost
University of Tennessee Martin

Dr. Lana Hamilton
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Board of Regents

Dr. Sharon Huo
Associate Provost
Tennessee Technological University

Dr. David Manderscheid
Provost
University of Tennessee Knoxville

Dr. Linda Martin
Vice President Academic Affairs & Student Success
University of Tennessee

Dr. David Rudd
President
University of Memphis

Dr. Donna Seagle
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Walters State Community College

Dr. Chris Whaley
President
Roane State Community College

2020-25 HIGHER EDUCATION MASTER PLAN

The state's Higher Education Master Plan provides a strategic vision for the state, highlights promising practices, and serves as the foundation for QAF. In January 2020, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission approved the 2020-25 Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan update that continues the dedication to high quality credentials that prepare graduates for sustainable careers. In addition, the Master Plan update emphasizes the importance of critically examining outcomes to ensure that all students have the tools necessary for success including low-income students and students of color who remain underrepresented in public higher education in Tennessee.

2020-25 QAF CYCLE SHIFTS IN POINTS AMONG STANDARDS

QAF Cycle Revisions	Community College		University	
Standard	2015-20	**2020-25**	2015-20	**2020-25**
1. General Education	15	**10**	15	**10**
2. Major Field Assessment	15	**15**	15	**15**
3. Academic Programs	15	**25**	25	**35**
o *Specialty Accreditation*	*5*	*15*	*5*	*15*
o *Program Evaluation*	*10*	*10*	*20*	*20*
4. Institutional Satisfaction	10	**10**	10	**10**
5. Student Equity	-	**10**	-	**10**
Adult Learner Success	*10*	**-**	*10*	**-**
6. Job Placement	10	**10**	NA	**NA**
7. Student Access & Success	25	**20**	25	**20**
TOTAL	100	**100**	100	**100**

MAJOR THEMES OF 2020-25 QAF STANDARDS RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Increase Points Associated with Accreditation:** The Advisory Committee recommends the points associated with the accreditation portion of the Academic Programs standard be increased from 5 to 15 points to reflect the rigor and institutional resources required to maintain specialty program accreditations. Five points shifted from the General Education and Student Access and Success standard to account for the additional 10 points.

- **Focus on Student Equity:** The Advisory Committee recommends 10 points be directed at increasing equity in higher education outcomes through a Student Equity standard. Institutions will select a historically underserved population significant to their mission and work to increase outcomes for that population on qualitative and quantitative metrics. In the Student Access and Success standard, the Advisory Committee recommends one of the three populations selected include either low-income, African American, or Hispanic graduates to address those populations with the largest gaps in postsecondary attainment and success.

- **Further Emphasis on Quality:** The mission of QAF is to increase the quality of instruction and services provided to students. Therefore, the Advisory Committee recommends metrics related to focus populations in the Student Equity and Student Access and Success standards be calculated based on graduates percent per 100 FTE growth rather than headcount whenever possible. The shift in methodology seeks to decouple QAF from the number of graduates and focus on how well an institution serves enrolled students.

- **Workforce Alignment:** The Advisory Committee recommends establishing a High-Need Programs focus population aligned to the state's higher education Master Plan to include STEM and Health Professions.

RECOMMENDATION

THEC staff recommends approval of the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding (QAF) standards by the Commission and will continue to work with the QAF Advisory Committee to prepare a guidebook to govern practices through the 2020-25 cycle.

Table of Contents

Standards

Appendices

Standard 1: General Education Assessment

Points   **10** points

Purpose   This standard is designed to provide incentives to institutions for improvements in the quality of undergraduate general education programs as measured by the performance of graduates on an approved standardized test of general education.

Evaluation   Success is measured by the overall performance (mean score) of an institution as compared to national peers of similar size and type.

Process   **Assessments**

- Institutions must use the California Critical Thinking and Skills Test (CCTST), CAT, 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 2020-25 cycle.
- Institutions should notify the THEC staff of their general education test selection by June 1, 2020. See Appendix A.

Methodology

- Testing for this standard will be applied to all undergraduate students who have applied for graduation in all terms of the academic year (summer, fall, and spring).
    - 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.
- 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 THEC staff upon request.
- Institutions may apply to THEC staff 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 no greater than 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.

Performance Scoring

- Performance on general education assessment will be evaluated as a comparison of the institutional average score for a given cycle year with the national average for that year (Table 1).
- Comparisons will be made by dividing the institutional average by the national average (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 Table 1.

Table 1: General Education Scoring Table			
Inst to Natl Mean	**Points**	**Inst to Natl Mean**	**Points**
100%	**10**	84%-82%	**4**
99%-97%	**9**	81%-79%	**3**
96%-94%	**8**	78%-75%	**2**
93%-91%	**7**	74%-70%	**1**
90%-88%	**6**	Below 70%	**0**
87%-85%	**5**		

References   Appendix A – General Education Assessment Selection Form

Websites
- California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) www.insightassessment.com
- CAT Assessment https://www.tntech.edu/cat/
- ETS Proficiency Profile http://www.ets.org

Standard 2: 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 assessment will be considered successful if the assessment score is within 97 percent of the comparison score (national or institutional average). All undergraduate programs will be reported once during the 2020-25 cycle with the exception of licensure programs to be reported annually.

Process   **Methodology**
- For purposes of this standard, all mature academic programs at the same degree level bearing the same CIP code constitute a program.
  - Example: B.A. and B.S. in Psychology are one program.
  - Closely related programs may be considered as one at the request of the institution and the approval of THEC staff.
- If both associate and baccalaureate degree programs are offered 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.
- Licensure programs at the associate and baccalaureate level will be reported annually.
- Non-licensure programs elevated from current concentrations before August 2023 must be scheduled for testing during the 2020-25 cycle as they represent a mature concentration with significant enrollment.
- 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
- A list of approved major field assessments has been developed by THEC staff. Appendix B lists all approved major field tests.
- During the cycle, assessments may be submitted to THEC staff 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 do not align with the learning outcomes of the program.
- Local tests can be made by a single institution or in concert with other institutions.
- Joint degree programs must utilize the same major field assessment.

- Plans for new local tests should be submitted to THEC staff for prior approval.
- 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 and guidelines regarding test construction, timelines, and reporting requirements.

Locally Developed Major Field Assessment Timeline	
1st Year: Planning	**Institutional Actions**
Summer/Fall Semesters	• Complete the Plan form and submit to THEC • Develop assessment • Secure 2 reviews from external consultants
Spring Semester	• Pilot administration and make any adjustments
2nd Year: Baseline	• Assess all expected fall and spring graduates. Results will be the comparison score submitted in the reporting year
3rd Year: Reporting	• Assess all expected fall and spring graduates • Report baseline and reporting year data for scoring

Exemptions

Programs may be exempt from the requirements of the Major Field Assessment standard with approval of THEC staff if the program meets any of the following conditions:
- Certificate programs
- Programs where the curriculum cannot be assessed in a standardized way including some interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs.
- Low producing programs
    - Associate programs that have not generated an average of 10 graduates per year or a minimum of 30 graduates during the time period 2016-17 to 2018-19.
    - Baccalaureate programs that have not generated an average of 10 graduates per year, or a minimum of 50 graduates during the time period 2014-15 to 2018-19.
- Programs in phase out or inactive.
- New programs
    - Associate programs: 3-year period to reach maturity, must test during the 2020-25 cycle unless meets a different exemption condition.
    - Baccalaureate programs: 5-year period to reach maturity, programs approved after July 2020 will be exempt for the 2020-25 cycle.

Performance Scoring

- Comparisons are made by dividing the institutional average by the comparison score average for that reporting year (no attainment may exceed 100 percent).
- The overall percentage will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage point which will be compared with Table 2 to award points.
- Scoring is cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the 2020-25 cycle.
- Institutions that show a consistent lack of participation may be subject to loss of points.

National Assessments

- Programs that use standardized tests (e.g., ETS, ACAT) will use the national comparison based on Carnegie classification, institution size, or other appropriate comparison.
- All licensure programs will be compared with appropriate national first-time 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 2015-20 cycle.
- Programs utilizing a new locally developed assessment will use the baseline year score for comparison.

Table 2: Major Field Assessment Scoring Table							
Percent	Points	Percent	Points	Percent	Points	Percent	Points
100 – 97	**15**	90 – 89	**11**	82 – 81	**7**	74 – 73	**3**
96 – 95	**14**	88 – 87	**10**	80 – 79	**6**	72 – 71	**2**
94 – 93	**13**	86 – 85	**9**	78 – 77	**5**	70	**1**
92 – 91	**12**	84 – 83	**8**	76 – 75	**4**	Below 70	**0**

References

- Appendix B – Major Field Assessments, Approved Assessments
- Appendix C – Major Field Assessment, Local Test Development Plan

Standard 3: Academic Programs, Accreditation & Program Evaluation

Points   **25** points community colleges and **35** for universities

Purpose   This indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence through external evaluation.

Evaluation   For accreditable programs, evaluation is based on the percentage of eligible programs which are in good standing with accreditors or making adequate progress toward accreditation. For non-accreditable programs, evaluation is based on a set of objective standards.

Accreditation   **Eligible Programs (15 points)**
- A program is defined as accreditable if there is a recognized national agency which accredits programs for that field and degree level.
- Only programs which appear on the Tennessee Higher Education Commission Academic Program Inventory are included under this standard. Concentrations are not included.
- Exceptions: All academic programs should be considered for accreditation, unless they meet one of the following and have received prior approval from THEC staff:
    1. Appropriate accrediting agency does not exist
    2. Significant obstacles to accreditation because of program organization or curriculum

Approved Accreditation Agencies
- THEC staff maintains a list of approved accrediting agencies (Appendix D) and institutions should seek accreditation from the approved list.
- 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 with the support of the Chief Academic Officer 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 must begin the process to seek accreditation.
- If an accrediting agency is removed from the list and the program accreditation expires before the cycle ends, the academic program will be subject to non-accreditable program evaluation during the 2020-25 cycle.

Reporting
- Each institution submitted documentation to THEC staff in support of all accredited programs by July 1, 2020.
    - Accredited programs in good standing should provide updated accreditation letters as they become available.

- Programs seeking accreditation or working to remediate significant citations should complete the Accreditation Progress Worksheet (Appendix E).
- 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 THEC can maintain accurate accreditation information.

Performance Scoring

- The number of accredited programs plus those making adequate progress toward accreditation 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 3A.

Table 3A: Accreditation Scoring Table							
Percent	**Points**	**Percent**	**Points**	**Percent**	**Points**	**Percent**	**Points**
100	**15**	92 – 91	**11**	84 – 83	**7**	75 – 74	**3**
99 – 97	**14**	90 – 89	**10**	82 – 81	**6**	73 – 72	**2**
96 – 95	**13**	88 – 87	**9**	79 – 78	**5**	71 – 70	**1**
94 – 93	**12**	86 – 85	**8**	77 – 76	**4**	Below 70	**0**

Program Evaluation

Eligible Programs (10 points Community Colleges, 20 points Universities)

- **Community Colleges**: All non-accreditable, active certificate and degree programs must be evaluated through Program Review or Academic Audit, including all programs approved by TBR as of January 2020.
  - If the program contains an embedded certificate, the review of the certificate program will be completed as part of the associate degree program.
  - An embedded certificate is defined as a certificate program with curriculum, content, and requirements contained within the greater requirements of a related associate degree. The associate degree assumes responsibility for quality control and assurance.
- **Universities:** All non-accreditable, active degree programs must be evaluated through Program Review, including all programs approved by THEC as of January 2020.

Methodology

- Program Maturity
  - New programs approved after January 2020 and reaching maturity during the 2020-25 cycle must be evaluated.
    - Certificate and associate degree programs: 3-year period after implementation.
    - Baccalaureate and Masters programs: 5-year period after implementation.
    - Doctoral programs: 7-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 A1.0.13A for Academic Proposals.

Schedule
- Each institution notified THEC of its schedule and evaluation type for all non-accreditable programs by June 1, 2020.
- All institutions must schedule non-accreditable degree programs within a five to seven-year period mirroring the average accrediting cycle.
- 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 THEC staff. Reviewers must complete the appropriate Program Review Rubric by degree designation. See Appendix F, G and H.
  - No institutional faculty or staff should participate in or influence the completion of the Program Review rubrics.
- Reporting
  - For each non-accreditable program evaluated through Program Review, the following must accompany the institution's Quality Assurance Funding submission:
    - Program Review Rubric,
    - Reviewer's narrative report, and
    - Abbreviated vitas of the external reviewer(s), limit 5 pages

Academic Audit
- The Academic Audit must be conducted by a team of 2-4 members trained and coordinated by the Tennessee Board of Regents. Audit Team members must complete the Academic Audit Rubric. See Appendix 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

Performance — Scoring Program Review and Academic Audit
- 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 3B.
- Scoring will be cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the 2020-25 cycle.
- For universities, undergraduate and graduate programs will be scored separately.

Table 3B: Program Evaluation Scoring Table			
Average	**Points**	**Average**	**Points**
3.0 – 2.9	**10**	1.4 – 1.2	**4**
2.8 – 2.7	**9**	1.1 – 0.9	**3**
2.6 – 2.4	**8**	0.8 – 0.6	**2**
2.3 – 2.1	**7**	0.5 – 0.3	**1**
2.0 – 1.8	**6**	Below 0.3	**0**
1.7 – 1.5	**5**		

Website   https://www.tbr.edu/academics/academic-audit

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

Standard 4: Institutional Satisfaction Studies, Community College

Points   **10** points

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

Schedule

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2020 – 21	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 2: 2021 – 22	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) & Qualitative Report
Year 3: 2022 – 23	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 4: 2023 – 24	Alumni Survey *if not possible: Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)*
Year 5: 2025 – 25	Institutional Satisfaction Comprehensive Study Report

Years 1 & 3   **Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**

- In Years 1 and 3 of the 2020-25 cycle, CCSSE will be administered to a representative sample of undergraduate students to explore the perceptions of students regarding programs, services and environment of the institution. CCSSE Engagements Benchmarks include:
    - Academic Challenge
    - Active and Collaborative Learning
    - Student Effort
    - Support for Learners
    - Student-Faculty Interaction
- Institutions will administer CCSSE to students in classes randomly selected by the Center for Community College Student Engagement. Institutions will follow the most recent sampling procedures of the Center to determine the number of surveys based on the institution's fall enrollment.

CCSSE Scoring

- Community colleges will be evaluated based on their performance compared to their peers determined by the Center.
- Scoring will be based on 38 questions selected from the CCSSE Student Engagement Themes and questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range.

Table 4A: CCSSE Scoring Table (Years 1 & 3)			
Successful Items	**Points**	**Successful Items**	**Points**
38 – 34	**10**	14 – 11	**4**
33 – 30	**9**	10 – 8	**3**
29 – 27	**8**	7 – 4	**2**
26 – 23	**7**	3 - 2	**1**
22 – 19	**6**	Below 2	**0**
18 – 15	**5**		

Year 2   **Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)**

- In Year 2, and potentially Year 4, of the 2020-25 cycle, SENSE will be administered to explore the perceptions of entering students regarding programs, services, and environment of the institution.
- SENSE is administered during the early weeks of the fall academic term to students in courses randomly selected by the Center from those most likely to enroll entering students.
- SENSE collects information on student Engagement Benchmarks including:
  - Academic and Social Support Network
  - Clear Academic Plan and Pathway
  - Early Connections
  - Effective Tracking to College Readiness
  - Engaged Learning
  - High Expectations

SENSE Scoring (7 of 10 points)

- Community colleges will be evaluated based on their performance compared to their peers as determined by the Center.
- Scoring will be based on 38 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.

Table 4B: SENSE Scoring Table Year 2			
Successful Items	**Points**	**Successful Items**	**Points**
38 – 32	**7**	14 – 10	**3**
31 – 27	**6**	9 – 5	**2**
26 – 21	**5**	4 – 2	**1**
20 – 15	**4**	Below 2	**0**

SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Report Scoring (3 of 10 points)

- In Year 2 of the 2020-25 cycle, community colleges will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report including analysis of Year 1 CCSSE and Year 2 SENSE results.
- The Qualitative Analysis Report should examine discrepancies and trends in the perceptions and behaviors of newly enrolled students and all other students on campus over time. See Appendix J.
- 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.

Year 4   **Community College Alumni Survey (10 points)**

- In Year 4, Community Colleges will work with TBR and THEC staff to develop and administer survey to collect data from alumni on experiences with admissions, academics, advising, campus environment, and workforce preparation.

Scoring

- If a national comparison score is available, questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range.
- If a national comparison score is not available, institutions will utilize the information gathered to develop a qualitative report of findings based a rubric designed by THEC in collaboration with TBR. 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.

Survey of Entering Student Engagement (if necessary)

- *If a Community College Alumni Survey is determined by THEC to be untenable, institutions will utilize the SENSE survey in Year 4.*
- *Scoring will be based on 38 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.*

Table 4C: SENSE Scoring Table (Year 4)			
Items above Mean	**Points**	**Items above Mean**	**Points**
38 – 34	**10**	14 – 11	**4**
33 – 30	**9**	10 – 8	**3**
29 – 27	**8**	7 – 4	**2**
26 – 23	**7**	3 - 2	**1**
22 – 19	**6**	Below 2	**0**
18 – 15	**5**		

Year 5   **Comprehensive Report (10 points)**

- In Year 5 of the 2020-25 cycle, community colleges will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report including analysis from the following survey administrations:
  - 2015-20 QAF: Year 1 & 3 SENSE and Year 2 & 4 CCSSE
  - 2020-25 QAF cycle: Year 1 and 3 CCSSE, Year 2 SENSE, and Year 4 Alumni Survey or SENSE.

- The Qualitative Analysis Report should examine discrepancies and trends in the perceptions and behaviors of newly enrolled students and other students on campus over time. Institutions will report on actions taken based on the results of the institutional satisfaction surveys administered in the 2015-20 and 2020-25 QAF cycles.
- 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.

Scoring

- Reports will be assigned from 0 to 10 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC staff. Complete rubric will be provided as soon as possible.

References   Appendix J – Institutional Satisfaction, Community College Year 2 Qualitative Report Rubric

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

Standard 4: Institutional Satisfaction, 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 and alumni.

Schedule

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2020 – 21	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 2: 2021 – 22	Qualitative Analysis Report
Year 3: 2022 – 23	PEG Alumni Survey
Year 4: 2023 – 24	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 5: 2025 – 25	Institutional Satisfaction Comprehensive Study Report

Years 1 & 4   **National Survey of Student Engagement (10 points)**

- In Year 1 and Year 4 of the 2020-25 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. NSSE includes questions around the following themes:
    - Academic Challenge
    - Campus Environment
    - Experiences with Faculty
    - Learning with Peers
- Institutions will follow the most recent sampling procedures of NSSE which will determine methodology and survey administration.

Scoring

- Universities will be measured based on their performance as compared with public institutions in their same Carnegie classification.
- Scoring will be based on the 47 questions selected by THEC staff from the NSSE Engagement Themes for first year and senior students.
- Questions will be considered unsuccessful when students' average is statically significantly lower than peers ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.

Table 4D: NSSE Scoring Table (Years 1 & 4)			
Items above Mean	**Points**	**Items above Mean**	**Points**
94 – 85	**10**	37 – 28	**4**
84 – 75	**9**	27 – 19	**3**
73 – 66	**8**	18 – 9	**2**
65 – 56	**7**	8 – 5	**1**
55 – 47	**6**	Below 5	**0**
46 – 38	**5**		

Year 2 **NSSE Qualitative Report (10 points)**
- In Year 2 of the 2020-25 cycle, universities will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report including analysis of Year 1 NSSE results.
- The Qualitative Analysis Report should examine discrepancies and trends in the perceptions and behaviors of freshmen and seniors at the institution.

Scoring
- Whole points will be given for acceptable analysis based on the rubric provided in Appendix K.
- The Qualitative Analysis Report will be evaluated by THEC staff.

Year 3 **PEG Alumni Attitude Survey (10 points)**
- 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. THEC staff will work with institutions and PEG staff to develop a common alumni survey and establish survey administration guidelines.

Scoring
- Universities will be scored based on their performance against the means of public universities in their same Carnegie classification that participated in PEG in either 2021-22 or 2022-23.
- National Mean Questions: A question is considered successful when the effect size is less than -0.2. A 95 percent confidence interval was used to determine significance.
- Longitudinal Institution Questions: THEC will work with PEG to establish a method for determining success in questions in which institutional data from the 2017-18 PEG administration serves as the comparison data.

Table 4E: PEG Scoring Table			
Items above Mean	**Points**	**Items above Mean**	**Points**
45 – 41	**10**	17 – 14	**4**
40 – 36	**9**	13 – 9	**3**
35 – 32	**8**	8 – 5	**2**
31 – 27	**7**	4 – 2	**1**
26 – 23	**6**	Below 2	**0**
22 – 18	**5**		

Year 5 **Comprehensive Report (10 points)**
- In Year 5 of the 2020-25 cycle, universities will submit a Qualitative Analysis Report including analysis from the following survey administrations:
  o 2015-20 QAF: Year 1 & 4 NSSE, Year 2 FSSE, and Year 3 PEG
  o 2020-25 QAF cycle: Year 1 and 4 NSSE and Year 3 PEG
- The Qualitative Analysis Report should examine discrepancies and trends in the perceptions and behaviors of first year and senior students and alumni over time. Institutions will report on actions taken based on the results of the institutional satisfaction surveys administered in the 2015-20 and 2020-25 QAF cycles.

- 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.

Scoring

Reports will be assigned from 0 to 10 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC staff. Complete rubric will be provided as soon as possible.

References   Appendix K – Institutional Satisfaction, University Year 2 Qualitative Report Rubric

Websites
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) http://nsse.indiana.edu/
- PEG Alumni Attitude Study (PEG) http://alumniattitudestudy.org/

Standard 5: Student Equity

Points   **10** points

Purpose   This standard is designed to incentivize institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively improve outcomes for populations historically underserved in higher education in alignment with the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan. The standard directs institutions to enhance the quality of student services and institutional support to increase equity in student outcomes.

Evaluation   Through an institutional self-assessment and engagement with students of the target population, institutions will create a plan to address strengths and areas needing improvement in order to develop measurable and achievable objectives to improve the services and experiences of student in the selected population. Institutions will also be evaluated on their success in improving student equity through an increase in undergraduate retention rates for students in the target population.

Process   **Selection of Target Population**
- Institutions may select a population of undergraduate students that has been historically underserved by higher education that is of particular importance to their mission in alignment with the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan.
- Populations must include sufficient numbers of students to analyze a full-time, fall to fall undergraduate retention rate, a minimum of 10 percent of undergraduate population is suggested.
- Target population selection form is due to THEC no later than **September 1, 2020** and is subject to approval by THEC staff. See Appendix L.

Qualitative Indicators (4 points)
- Through self-assessment and engagement with students in the target population, institutions will develop a strategy to enhance strengths and address areas needing improvement. Each year of the 2020-25 cycle will challenge institutions to build on previous efforts to increase equity for selected population.
   - **2020-21 Self-Assessment:** Institutions will submit a Self-Assessment that includes the current state of target student access and success including baseline quantitative and qualitative measures.
   - **2021-22, Action Plan:** Institutions will submit a strategic Action Plan that seeks to improve the quality of services and experiences and increase student retention of the target population based on institutional data and target student feedback.
   - **2022-23 & 2023-24 Status Report:** 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.
   - **2024-25 Comprehensive Report**: 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 and best practices to sustain gains in student equity.

Quantitative Indicator (6 points)
- Institutions will also focus on the full-time, fall to fall undergraduate retention of the selected population. Institutions should work to ensure that equity continues to increase through rising rates of retention.

Evaluation   **Scoring**

A total of 10 points are available each year through the Student Equity standard. Each year, institutions will be scored on the qualitative and quantitative elements as detailed below.

Student Equity Scoring Indicators				
Year	**Qualitative Indicators**		**Quantitative Indicators**	
2020-21	Self-Assessment	4 points	Retention	6 points
2021-22	Action Plan	4 points	Retention	6 points
2022-23	Status Report	4 points	Retention	6 points
2023-24	Status Report	4 points	Retention	6 points
2024-25	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Retention	6 points

Qualitative Indicators Scoring
- Progress toward improving student equity will be evaluated by THEC staff using scoring rubrics to distribute Quality Assurance Funding points. See Appendix M for scoring rubrics for Year 1. Additional rubrics will be provided as soon as possible.

Quantitative Indicators Scoring
- Progress toward improving success of the target student population will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average of undergraduate, full-time, fall to fall retention with the retention rate in that year. The retention will be compared to Table 5 to award points for rates.

Table 5: Student Equity Scoring Table	
Percent Achieved	**Points**
100 – 97	6
96 – 94	5
91 – 88	4
87 – 85	3
84 – 82	2
81 – 80	1
Below 80	0

References   Appendix L – Student Equity Population Selection Form
Appendix M – Student Equity Evaluation

Standard 6: 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) is used for statewide job placement analysis that is uniform across all community colleges.
- Data for graduates during an academic year will be used to calculate the Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement rate.
  - All technical certificates and associate degrees are included with the exception of transfer programs (ex. University Parallel and Professional Studies).
- The Tennessee Job Market consists of individuals employed full time and those approved for an unemployment insurance claim in Tennessee within four quarters of graduation.
- Graduates have four quarters from graduation to find full-time employment in order to be considered placed.
- *Given the healthcare crisis' effect on unemployment, THEC will work with TBR and the Department of Labor to make calculation modifications as necessary to balance rigor with unprecedented circumstances.*

Cycle Year	Graduates Included in Analysis
Year 1: 2020-21	Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
Year 2: 2021-22	Summer 2019, Fall 2019 and Spring 2020
Year 3: 2022-23	Summer 2020, Fall 2020 and Spring 2021
Year 4: 2023-24	Summer 2021, Fall 2021 and Spring 2022
Year 5: 2024-25	Summer 2022, Fall 2022 and Spring 2023

Scoring   **Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement Rate Scoring**
- The placement rate is calculated by dividing the total number of graduates working full-time in any of the four quarters after graduation without an unemployment claim 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 6 to award points on this standard.

Table 6: TN Job Market Placement Rate Scoring Table					
Percent Placed	Points	Percent Placed	Points	Percent Placed	Points
100 – 99	**10**	92 – 91	**6**	78 – 74	**2**
98 – 97	**9**	90 – 89	**5**	73 – 70	**1**
96 – 95	**8**	88 – 84	**4**	Below 70	**0**
94 – 93	**7**	83 – 79	**3**		

Standard 7: Student Access and Success

Points **20** points

Purpose The Student Access and Success standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to increase the percentage or 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 graduation outcomes for those students.

Process **Selection of Focus Populations**
- The available focus populations include those individually identified the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan as critical in achieving the postsecondary goals of the state and by institutions as critical to their institutional mission and service area.
- Institutions will select a total of four focus populations, one of which must be either African American, Hispanic, or low-income students as these students are highlighted as critical in the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plans and see the most disparate postsecondary outcomes.
- Analysis will include undergraduate technical certificates, associate degrees, and bachelor's degrees, unless otherwise noted as including graduate programs.
- Institutional selections forms are due to THEC by **September 1, 2020.**
- Institutions may select from the options listed below or propose a unique population for consideration by THEC staff.
- The Focus Population Selection Form, definitions and data sources can be found in Appendix N.

Focus Populations by Calculation Method	
Percent Awards per 100 FTE	**Award Count**
1. Academically Underprepared	1. Associate Degree Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities (community college only)
2. African American	
3. First Generation	2. Baccalaureate Degree Graduates with Previously Earned Associate Degree (univ only)
4. Geographic High Need Area	
5. Historically Underserved Populations Graduate Degrees (Racial Minority or Low-Income)	3. High-Needs Programs – Graduate Degrees
6. Hispanic	4. High-Needs Programs – Undergraduate Degrees
7. Low-Income	
8. Males	
9. SPARC Counties (economically distressed & at-risk)	
10. Veterans (self-reported)	

Evaluation   **Student Access and Success Scoring**

- Success with a focus population may be measured in one of two ways:
  - Percent of Awards per 100 FTE: populations will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average of percent of graduates per 100 FTE as compared with the percent from that year. See Appendix O.
  - Total Awards: populations will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average of number of graduates as compared with the attainment of that year.
- The resulting percent attainment will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage and compared to Table 7 to award points for this indicator.
- Points will be summed for all four focus populations with a 20 point maximum.

Table 7: Student Access & Success Scoring Tale			
Percent Achieved	**Points**	**Percent Achieved**	**Points**
100 – 97	**5**	90 – 88	**2**
96 – 94	**4**	87 – 80	**1**
93 – 91	**3**	Below 80	**0**

Reference
- Appendix N –Student Access and Success Focus Populations Selection Form
- Appendix O – Student Access and Success Awards per 100 FTE Calculation

Appendices

Appendix A: General Education Selection Form

Appendix B: Major Field Assessments, Approved Assessments

Appendix C: Major Field Assessments, Local Test Development Plan

Appendix D: Academic Programs, Approved Accreditation Agencies

Appendix E: Academic Programs, Accreditation Progress Worksheet

- E1: Programs Seeking Accreditation
- E2: Programs with Accreditation Delays

Appendix F: Academic Programs, Program Review, Certificate and Associate Rubric

Appendix G: Academic Programs, Program Review, Baccalaureate Rubric

Appendix H: Academic Programs, Program Review, Graduate Rubric

Appendix I: Academic Programs, Academic Audit Rubric

Appendix J: Institutional Satisfaction, Community College Year 2 Qualitative Report Rubric

Appendix K: Institutional Satisfaction, University Year 2 Qualitative Report Rubric

Appendix L: Student Equity Population Selection Form

Appendix M: Study Equity Evaluation

Appendix N: Student Access and Success Focus Population Selection Form

Appendix O: Student Access and Success Awards per 100 FTE Calculation

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 1: General Education Assessment

THEC

General Education Assessment Selection Form

The General Education standard of Quality Assurance Funding provides incentives to institutions for improvements in the quality of undergraduate general education programs as measured by the performance of graduates on an approved standardized assessment of general education. Institutions may choose to sample graduates and may select from assessments approved the Quality Assurance Funding Advisory Committee to be used for the duration of the 2020-25 cycle.

Institution: _____

General Education Assessment

_____ California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST)

Delivery Method
_____ Online
_____ Traditional Paper and Pencil

_____ CAT Assessment

_____ ETS Proficiency Profile

Delivery Method   **Test Length**
_____ Online   _____ Standard (2 hours)
_____ Traditional Paper and Pencil   _____ Abbreviated (40 minutes)

Sampling Methodology

_____ Test entire graduating student population (summer, fall and spring)

_____ Test representative sample of the graduating student population.

- **Sampling Plan:** Institutions must submit a Sampling Plan that includes an explanation of how graduates are selected for sampling across the institution.
- **Statistical Requirements:** testing must meet a minimum threshold of a 95% confidence level with a margin of error of 3. Using the data provided, please complete the chart below to acknowledge the **percent of graduates** that must be tested to fulfill the statistical requirements for QAF. Failure to meet these requirements could result in a loss of points.

3 Year Average*	Approximate Sample	Percent of Graduates

If during the 2020-25 cycle, there is a considerable change in the number of graduates, an institution may request a modification to the percent of graduates required for testing.

Sampling Requirements based on Undergraduate Degree Productivity*					
Institution	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	3 Yr Avg	Approx. Sample	% of Graduates
APSU	1,886	1,994	1,921	1,934	688	36%
ETSU	2,326	2,442	2,448	2,405	739	31%
MTSU	4,157	4,033	4,067	4,086	846	21%
TSU	1,173	1,149	1,132	1,151	554	48%
TTU	2,116	2,173	1,966	2,085	706	34%
UOM	3,101	3,136	2,971	3,069	792	26%
UTC	2,003	2,024	2,082	2,036	700	34%
UTK	4,652	4,723	4,919	4,765	872	18%
UTM	1,230	1,154	1,166	1,183	561	47%
Chattanooga	1,411	1,498	1,494	1,468	618	42%
Cleveland	918	1,039	900	952	503	53%
Columbia	845	954	950	916	493	54%
Dyersburg	502	567	586	552	364	66%
Jackson	706	747	680	711	427	60%
Motlow	971	1,135	1,182	1,096	541	49%
Nashville	1,731	1,332	1,283	1,449	615	42%
Northeast	1,367	1,428	1,408	1,401	606	43%
Pellissippi	2,285	2,350	2,048	2,228	722	32%
Roane	1,011	1,172	1,130	1,104	543	49%
Southwest	1,338	1,284	1,125	1,249	576	46%
Volunteer	1,495	1,509	1,562	1,522	628	41%
Walters	1,957	1,942	1,333	1,744	662	38%

Source: Graduate projections are based on all degrees awarded in 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 as reported in the THEC Student Information System.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 2: Major Field Assessment

THEC

Major Field Assessment: Approved Assessments

The Major Field Assessment standard of Quality Assurance Funding 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. Undergraduates should be tested with an approved assessment, from the assessments below through an approved locally created assessment, in accordance with QAF guidelines.

Approved Major Field Assessments: Licensure Programs	
Academic Program	**Assessment**
Dental Hygiene	Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations National Board Dental Hygiene Examination
Health Information	American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA)
Human Services	Center for Credentialing and Education Human Services Board Certified Practitioner
Medical Laboratory Technology	American Medical Technologies Medical Laboratory Technologist Certification OR American Society for Clinical Pathology
Nursing	National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCLEX)
Occupational Therapy	National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant (COTA); OR National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy Occupational Therapists Registered (OTR)
Ophthalmic Technician	Joint Commission on Allied Heath Personnel in Ophthalmology Certified Ophthalmic Technician
Opticianry	American Board of Opticianry National Opticianry Competency Examination
Physical Therapy	Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy National Physical Therapy Examination
Radiology	American Society of Radiologic Technologists American Registry of Radiologic Technologist Examination
Respiratory Care	National Board of Respiratory Care Certified Respiratory Therapist (CRT) OR National Board for Respiratory Care Registered Respiratory Therapist (RRT)
Surgical Technology	National Board of Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting
Teacher Education	Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity edTPA

Approved Major Field Assessments: Programs Tested Once Per Cycle	
Programs/Subjects	**Assessment**
Accounting	Accreditation Council for Accountancy and Taxation (ACAT)
Administrative Assistant	Office Proficiency Assessment Certification (OPAC)
Architecture	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards Architectural Registration Examination
Automotive Technology	National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence
Business	Peregrine Academic Services Business Administration Exam
Chemistry	American Chemical Society Examination
Computer and Information Sciences	Institute of Certification of Computer Professionals Examination *OR* Brainbench
Computing Technology	Computing Technology Industry Association Certification Exam
Dental Assisting	Dental Assisting National Board Certified Dental Assistant
Dietetics	Commission on Dietetic Registration American Dietetics Exam
Emergency Medicine	National Registry of Emergency Medicine Technicians Examination
Engineering	National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying *OR* Society of Manufacturing Engineering Technical Certification Test
Engineering Technology	National Occupational Competency Testing Institute *OR* National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies
Industrial Technology	Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering
Information Systems Technology	CompTIA A+ Certification *OR* Microsoft Office Specialist Certification Exam
Mechatronics Technology	Seimens Mechatronics System Exam
Office Administration	International Association of Administrative Professionals Certified Professional Secretary Examination
Soil Science	Soil Science Society of America
Sports Medicine	American College of Sports Medicine

Various *Available to Community colleges only*	**Educational Testing Service** 1. Biology 8. Mathematics 2. Business 9. Music 3. Chemistry 10. Physics 4. Computer Science 11. Political Science 5. Criminal Justice 12. Psychology 6. Economics 13. Sociology 7. Literature in English **Area Concentration Achievement Test** (ACAT) 1. Agriculture* 5. Criminal Justice* 9. Political Science 2. Biology 6. Geology 10. Psychology 3. Business* 7. History 11. Social Work 4. Communication 8. Literature in English

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 2: Major Field Assessment

THEC

Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Form

The Major Field Assessment standard of Quality Assurance Funding 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. 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, 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 assessment from two consultants outside the institution
- Pilot assessment for comparison during the Planning Year
- Provide campus coordinator with the following along with the completed Plan form:
  - Abbreviated 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.

Development of a local test is a three year process: planning year, baseline year, and reporting year.

Timeline	Benchmarks to Complete
1st Year: Planning Year	▪ Complete the Plan form and submit to THEC
Summer/Fall Semesters	▪ Develop assessment
	▪ Secure 2 reviews from external consultants
Spring Semester	▪ Pilot administration and make any adjustments
2nd Year: Baseline Year	▪ Assess all expected fall and spring graduates using the new assessment. Test results will serve as a baseline for comparison in the reporting year.
3rd Year: Reporting Year	▪ Assess all expected fall and spring graduates ▪ Institution must report both baseline year and reporting year data for scoring.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 2: Major Field Assessment

THEC

Major Field Assessment: Local Test Development Form

Institution: _____

Academic Program: _____

Check one box to note 3-year process (planning year, baseline year, and reporting year)
❑ Planning Year 2020-21, Baseline 2021-22, and Reporting Year 2022-23
❑ Planning Year 2021-22, Baseline 2022-23, and Reporting Year 2023-24
❑ Planning Year 2022-23, Baseline 2023-24, and Reporting Year 2024-25

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/Affiliation		

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

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 3: Academic Programs

Academic Programs: Approved Accreditation Agencies

The Accreditation portion of the Academic Programs standard incentives institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation through external evaluation. For those academic programs that are accreditable, institutions are expected to seek and maintain national accreditation by one of the accreditation agencies listed below.

Academic Programs: Approved Accreditation Agencies		
Discipline	**Acronym**	**Accrediting Agency**
Allied Health	CAAHEP	Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs[1]
Architecture	NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Board
Art and Design	NASAD	National Association of Schools of Art and Design
Athletic Training	CAATE	Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education
Audiology/Speech-Language Pathology	ASHA	American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Aviation	AABI	Aviation Accreditation Board International
Biochemistry	ASBMB	American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Business	ACBSP	Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs[2]
Business	AACSB	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business[3]
Chemistry	ACS	American Chemical Society
Clinical Laboratory Sciences	NAACLS	National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences
Clinical Pastoral Education	ACPEAC	Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc. – Accreditation Commission
Counseling	ACA	American Counseling Association
Culinary	ACF	American Culinary Federation
Dance	NASD	National Association of Schools of Dance
Dentistry	ADA	American Dental Association
Dietetics	ACEND	Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics
Engineering (Applied Science, Computing and Technology)	ABET	Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology

Discipline	Acronym	Accrediting Agency
Environmental Health Science	NEHA	National Environmental Health Association
Family and Consumer Sciences	AAFCS	American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences
Forestry	SAF	Society of American Foresters
Health Administration	CAHME	Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education
Health Information	CAHIIM	Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education
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
Physician Assistant	ARC-PA	Accreditation Review Commission on Education for Physician Assistants

Discipline	Acronym	Accrediting Agency
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
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 and Technology	AVMA	American Veterinary Medical Association

Footnotes

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

Advanced Cardiovascular Sonography	*Emergency Medical Services Professional*	*Orthotic & Prosthetic Technical*
Anesthesia Technologist/Technician	*Exercise Physiology*	*Orthotics and Prosthetics*
Anesthesiologist Assistant	*Exercise Science*	*Perfusion*
Art Therapy	*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*	

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. American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) accredits nursing programs at the baccalaureate and graduate levels.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 3: Academic Programs, Accreditation

THEC

Academic Programs: Accreditation Progress Worksheet

The Academic Programs: Accreditation standard incentivizes institutions to achieve and maintain programmatic excellence and accreditation through external evaluation. For those academic programs that are accreditable, institutions are expected to make adequate progress towards accreditation and maintain national accreditation. For new programs, the information contained will also be utilized to monitor program implementation as part of the Post Approval Monitoring program.

Academic programs seeking accreditation must complete the following worksheet until accreditation is attained. If the new program is seeking accreditation with the accreditor of other academic programs on campus, indicate those programs below including embedded certificates.

- New academic programs approved by THEC or TBR after August 1, 2020 must complete the worksheet within 90 days of approval. Beginning with the QAF submission in August 2021, programs must update sections C and D annually until accreditation is achieved.
- Academic programs approved prior to August 1, 2020 must complete the entire worksheet for QAF submission in August 2021. Beginning with the QAF submission in August 2022, programs must update Sections C and D annually until accreditation is achieved.

Institution:		Academic Year:	
Program Name:		**Level:**	**CIP:**
Approval Date:		**Implementation Date:**	
Accreditation Agency:			
Anticipated Application Date:		**Anticipated Site Visit Date:**	
College/Organizational Unit:			
Dean/Chair Contact Information:			
CIP	**Academic Program(s) with Same Accreditor** *(insert rows as needed)*		**Award Level**
	1.		
	2.		

A. Program Accreditation

Please describe the process required to attain accreditation through this particular accrediting agency. Description may include consultation with external consultants, self-studies, applications for candidacy, site visits, provisionary accreditation, and full accreditation.

B: Accreditation Criteria/Standards/Principles

Accrediting agencies have criteria, standards or principles of best practice as the foundation for excellence in the field. Please provide a plan of action for meeting these high-level criteria/standards/practices.

Criteria/Standards/Principles	Institutional Action Plan	Dates

Narrative to further explain Accreditation Criteria/Standards/Principles

C: Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks *(Annual update required)*

Accreditation agencies track aspects of academic programs and institutional support to determine compliance. Please complete the list of benchmarks and indicate where your institution is in meeting these expectations. Accreditation agencies vary, so please include any additional indicators that are unique to your accreditation agency, inserting rows as needed. If the benchmark does not apply, please indicate with n/a.

Indicator	Required by Accreditor	Current at Institution	Date expected to achieve
Faculty Ratio/Position			
Staff Ratio/Positions			
Curriculum			
Assessments			
Resources			
Job Placement			
Minimum Graduates Before Site Visit			
Other *(insert rows as needed)*			

Narrative to further explain Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks

```
```

D: Timeline for Accreditation *(Annual update required)*

Please provide a timeline of major milestones for your institution to attain accreditation and the date or anticipated date of completion. Activities may include resource allocation, hiring of faculty or staff, procurement of space or equipment, or curriculum design. These activities may lie within the department/college or at higher levels of leadership within the institution.

Activity	Current Status	Responsible Party	Date

Narrative to clarify elements of the timeline

```
```

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 3: Academic Programs, Accreditation

THEC

Academic Programs: Accreditation Progress Worksheet, Follow-Up

The Academic Programs: Accreditation standard incentivizes institutions to achieve and maintain programmatic excellence and accreditation through external evaluation. For those academic programs that are accreditable, institutions are expected to make adequate progress towards accreditation and maintain national accreditation. For new programs, the information contained will also be utilized to monitor program implementation as part of the Post Approval Monitoring program.

Academic programs seeking accreditation must complete the following worksheet until accreditation is attained. If the new program is seeking accreditation with the accreditor of other academic programs on campus, indicate those programs below including embedded certificates.

Institution:		Academic Year:	
Program Name:		Level:	CIP:
Approval Date:		Implementation Date:	
Accreditation Agency:			
Anticipated Application Date:		Anticipated Site Visit Date:	
College/Organizational Unit:			
Dean/Chair Contact Information:			
CIP	**Academic Program(s) with Same Accreditor** *(insert rows as needed)*		**Award Level**
	1.		
	2.		

C: Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks *(Annual update required)*

Accreditation agencies track aspects of academic programs and institutional support to determine compliance. Please complete the list of benchmarks and indicate where your institution is in meeting these expectations. Accreditation agencies vary, so please include any additional indicators that are unique to your accreditation agency, inserting rows as needed. If the benchmark does not apply, please indicate with n/a.

Indicator	Required by Accreditor	Current at Institution	Date expected to achieve
Faculty Ratio/Position			
Staff Ratio/Positions			
Curriculum			
Assessments			
Resources			
Job Placement			
Minimum Graduates Before Site Visit			
Other *(insert rows as needed)*			

Narrative to further explain Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks

```


```

D: Timeline for Accreditation *(Annual update required)*

Please provide a timeline of milestones for your institution to attain accreditation and the anticipated date or date of completion. Activities may include resource allocation, hiring of faculty or staff, procurement of space or equipment, or curriculum design. These activities may lie within the department/college or at higher levels of leadership within the institution.

Activity	Current Status	Responsible Party	Date

Narrative to clarify elements of the timeline

```


```

Accreditation Progress Worksheet: Programs with Accreditation Delays

The Academic Programs: Accreditation standard incentivizes institutions to achieve and maintain programmatic excellence and accreditation through external evaluation. For those academic programs that are accreditable, institutions are expected to make adequate progress towards accreditation and maintain national accreditation.

Academic programs that have experienced delays in progress towards accreditation, deferred accreditation, received significant accreditation citations/warnings, or lost accreditation are required to complete the worksheet annually as part of the Quality Assurance Funding submission in August. After the initial submission, only Sections C and D should be updated annually until accreditation is attained or deficiencies remediated.

Institution:		**Academic Year:**	
Accrediting Agency:			
Accreditation Status *(select one):* Seeking, *delayed* Accredited, *Significant Citations/Warnings* Lost Accreditation			
Date of Last Site Visit:		**Date of Next Site Visit:**	
College/Organizational Unit:			
Dean/Chair Contact Information:			
CIP	**Academic Program(s)** *(insert rows as needed)*		**Award Level**
	1.		
	2.		

A. Program Accreditation

Describe the process required to attain accreditation or remediate deficiencies sited by the accreditation agency. Description may include consultation with external consultants, follow-up reports, applications for candidacy, and site visits. Please attach any documentation or reports from accrediting agency regarding the reasons for delay/deferral or significant citation.

B: Accreditation Criteria/Standards/Principles

Accrediting agencies have criteria/standards/principles of best practice as the foundation for excellence in the field. Please describe the criteria/standards/principles that received a significant citation/warning, the citation/warning itself, and indicate your institution's corrective plan of action.

Standard with Significant Citation/Warning	Action Plan and Dates

Narrative to further explain Accreditation Themes/Principles

C: Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks *(Annual update required)*

Accreditation agencies track aspects of academic programs and institutional support to determine compliance. If the program has delayed or deferred accreditation, please describe the benchmark(s) that must be met and the intuition's plan of action. If the program has received a significant citation or lost accreditation, please elaborate on those indicators/benchmarks that were not met and the remediation plan.

Accreditation Indicator Benchmarks

D: Timeline for Accreditation *(Annual update required)*

Please provide a timeline of major milestones for your institution to attain accreditation or remediate deficiencies/citations and the date or anticipated date of completion. These activities may lie within the department/college or at higher levels of leadership within the institution.

Activity	Current Status	Responsible Party	Date

Narrative to clarify elements of the timeline

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 3: Academic Programs, Accreditation

THEC

Accreditation Progress Worksheet: Programs with Accreditation Delays, Follow-Up

The Academic Programs: Accreditation standard incentivizes institutions to achieve and maintain programmatic excellence and accreditation through external evaluation. For those academic programs that are accreditable, institutions are expected to make adequate progress towards accreditation and maintain national accreditation.

Academic programs that have experienced delays in progress towards accreditation, deferred accreditation, received significant accreditation citations, or lost accreditation are required to complete the worksheet annually as part of the Quality Assurance Funding submission in August. Institutions should continue to include any correspondence from the accrediting agency that has been issued since the last submission.

Institution:		**Academic Year:**	
Accrediting Agency:			
Accreditation Status *(select one):* Seeking, *delayed* Accredited, *Significant Citations/Warnings* Lost Accreditation			
Date of Last Site Visit:		**Date of Next Site Visit:**	
College/Organizational Unit:			
Dean/Chair Contact Information:			
CIP	**Academic Program(s)** *(insert rows as needed)*		**Award Level**
	1.		
	2.		

C: Accreditation Indicator/Benchmarks *(Annual update required)*

Accreditation agencies track aspects of academic programs and institutional support to determine compliance. If the program has delayed or deferred accreditation, please describe the benchmark(s) that must be met and the intuition's plan of action. If the program has received a significant citation or lost accreditation, please elaborate on those indicators/benchmarks that were not met and the remediation plan.

Accreditation Indicator Benchmarks

D: Timeline for Accreditation *(Annual update required)*

Please provide a timeline of major milestones for your institution to attain accreditation or remediate deficiencies/citations and the date or anticipated date of completion. These activities may lie within the department/college or at higher levels of leadership within the institution.

Activity	Current Status	Responsible Party	Date

Narrative to clarify elements of the timeline

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 3: Academic Programs

THEC

Program Review: Certificate and Associate Programs

Institution: _____

Academic Program:_____

Award: _____ CIP: _____

Embedded Certificates: _____

Instructions for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable 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 academic 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. Please check 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.

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 marking 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.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 3: Academic Programs

Program Review: Baccalaureate Programs

Institution: _____

Academic Program:_____

Award: _____ CIP: _____

Embedded Certificates: _____

Instructions for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable baccalaureate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following *Program Review Rubric*. The *Program Review Rubric* lists 30 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points 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.

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 marking 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. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
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.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 3: Academic Programs

THEC

Program Review: Graduate Programs

Institution: _____

Academic Program:_____

Award: _____   CIP: _____

Embedded Certificates: _____

Instructions for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2020-25 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable 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. Please mark 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.

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 marking 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 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.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 3: Academic Programs

THEC

Academic Audit: Undergraduate Programs

Institution: _____

Academic Program:_____

Award: _____   CIP: _____

Embedded Certificates: _____

Academic Audit Status: _____ First Academic Audit _____ Follow-Up Academic Audit

Instructions for Audit Team

In accordance with the 2020-25 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. Please mark 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.

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 marking 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.					

		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
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.					

		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
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.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 4: Institutional Satisfaction Study

THEC

Institutional Satisfaction: Community Colleges Year 2 Qualitative Report

The Institutional Satisfaction Study indicator of Quality Assurance Funding is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of undergraduate programs as evaluated by surveys of students at different points in their academic career. A unique schedule has been developed for community colleges to engage with different populations over the course of the 2020-25 QAF cycle. Institutions will engage with stakeholders in order to inform campus practices to promote continuous improvement.

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2020-21	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 2: 2021-22	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) & Qualitative Report
Year 3: 2022-23	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 4: 2023-24	Alumni Survey *if not possible: Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)*
Year 5: 2024-25	Institutional Satisfaction Comprehensive Study Report

Year 2 Qualitative Report Review

In Year 2 of the cycle, community colleges will reflect on the data and findings of the Year 1 CCSSE administration and Year 2 SENSE administration. Institutions will be asked to examine results of both surveys in order to compare students' perceptions of campus engagement near the beginning and end of their academic career. Institutions will submit a Year 2 Qualitative Report which details findings and how data will be used for institutional planning and improvement. Reports should not exceed 5 pages, excluding appendices. Qualitative reports will be evaluated by THEC staff for alignment and fulfillment of the scoring criteria indicated on the proceeding rubric. In Year 2, institutions may earn whole points between 0 and 3 for the Qualitative Report.

Year 2 Qualitative Analysis Report Rubric	
Institutions are to engage with survey data to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses in engagement among student in different stages of their academic careers.	**Points**
• National Peer Analysis: Analysis of CCSSE and SENSE data and findings including strengths and weaknesses in engagement of students as compared to their national peers.	**1**
• Campus Analysis: Analysis of CCSSE and SENSE data and findings including strengths and weaknesses related to engagement of students in early and late states of their academic careers at the college.	**2**
Total	**3**

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 4: Institutional Satisfaction Study

THEC

Institutional Satisfaction: University Year 2 Qualitative Report

The Institutional Satisfaction Study indicator of Quality Assurance Funding is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of student engagement as evaluated by surveys of students at different points in their academic career and university alumni. A unique schedule has been developed for universities to engage with different populations over the course of the 2020-25 QAF cycle. Institutions will engage with stakeholders in order to inform campus practices to promote continuous improvement.

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2020-21	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 2: 2021-22	Qualitative Report
Year 3: 2022-23	PEG Alumni Survey
Year 4: 2023-24	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 5: 2024-25	Institutional Satisfaction Comprehensive Study Report

Qualitative Report Review

In Year 2 of the cycle, universities will reflect on the data trends and findings of the Year 1 NSSE administration. Institutions will be asked to examine results of both freshmen and senior students in order to compare students' perceptions of campus engagement near the beginning and end of their academic career. Institutions will submit a Year 2 Qualitative Report which details findings and how data will be used for institutional planning and improvement. Reports should not exceed 10 pages, excluding appendices. Qualitative reports will be evaluated by THEC staff for alignment and fulfillment of the scoring criteria indicated on the proceeding rubrics. In Year 2, institutions may earn whole points between 0 and 10 for the Qualitative Report.

Year 2 Qualitative Analysis Report Rubric	
Institutions are to engage with survey data to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses in engagement among student in early and late stages of their academic careers.	**Points**
• National Peer Analysis: Analysis of NSSE data and findings including strengths and weaknesses in engagement of students as compared to their national peers.	**5**
• Campus Analysis: Analysis of NSSE data and findings including strengths and weaknesses related to engagement of students in early and late stages of their academic careers.	**5**
Total	**10**

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 5: Student Equity

THEC

Student Equity: Target Population Selection Form

The Student Equity standard is designed to incentivize institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively improve outcomes for populations historically underserved in higher education in alignment with the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan. The standard directs institutions to enhance the quality of student services and institutional support to increase equity in student outcomes.

Student Equity: Standard Schedule				
Year	**Qualitative Indicators**		**Quantitative Indicators**	
2020-21	Self-Assessment	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2021-22	Action Plan	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2022-23	Status Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2023-24	Status Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2024-25	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points

Institutions may select a population of undergraduate students that has been historically underserved by higher education that is important to their mission and work to increase the equity of outcomes for these students. Populations must include sufficient numbers of students to analyze a full-time, fall to fall undergraduate retention rate; a minimum of 10 percent of the undergraduate population is suggested. The Master Plan specifically calls out low-income students and students of color. Institutions may choose one of these populations or submit a population to THEC staff for consideration. All forms must be submitted to THEC by September 1, 2020.

Please consider carefully as selections cannot be revisited for the duration of the 2020-25 cycle.

Institution: _____

Target Population Selected: _____

Target Population Selection Justification: Please provide a brief explanation for why your institution has selected the target population including a definition of the target population and explanation of disparate outcomes at your institution. Please include data source if not included in Student Information System.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-15 Quality Assurance Funding
Standard 5: Student Equity

THEC

Student Equity Standard Evaluation

The Student Equity standard is designed to incentivize institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively improve outcomes for populations historically underserved in higher education in alignment with the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan. Institutions select a population of undergraduate students that has been historically underserved by higher education that is of particular importance to their mission. The standard directs institutions to enhance the quality of student services and institutional support to increase equity in student outcomes.

Student Equity: Point Allocation by Year				
Year	**Qualitative**		**Quantitative**	
2020-21	Self-Assessment	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2021-22	Action Plan	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2022-23	Status Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2023-24	Status Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points
2024-25	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Full-time, fall to fall Retention	6 points

Student Equity Scoring

Qualitative Elements Scoring: Through an institutional self-assessment and engagement with students of the target population, institutions will create a plan to maximize strengths and address areas needing improvement in order to develop measureable and achievable objectives to improve the services, experiences, and successes of target population students. Progress toward improving success of the target student population will be evaluated by THEC staff using scoring rubrics to distribute Quality Assurance Funding points. Rubrics for years 2 through 5 will be released as soon as possible.

Quantitative Elements Scoring: Institutions will also be evaluated on their success in improving retention of the selected target population. Progress toward improving success of the target population will be evaluated by comparing the three-year rolling average of full-time, fall to fall retention with the retention rate in that year.

Student Equity Scoring Table	
Percent Achieved	**Points**
100 – 97	6
96 – 94	5
91 – 88	4
87 – 85	3
84 – 82	2
81 – 80	1
Below 80	0

Student Equity: Scoring Rubric
Year 1: Self-Assessment

Scoring

Institutional Self-Assessments will be assigned from 0 to 4 points based on an evaluation conducted by THEC. The THEC 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 the target student population. The report should not exceed 10 pages, excluding appendices.

Self-Assessment: Year 1: 2020-21	
Institutions will submit a Self-Assessment that includes the current state of access and success for the target student population including baseline quantitative and qualitative measures.	**Points**
Comprehensive introduction to the campus environment for students of the target population that includes: • Definition of the target student population. • Overview of how serving students of the target population is uniquely incorporated into the institution's mission. • Explanation of how serving target population students align with the state high education master plan. • Description of the pre-enrollment outreach and recruitment activities to meet target student population enrollment goals, including wholistic admission policies at universities.	**1**

Thorough analysis of baseline data of the target student population including:
• Information on data source used for tracking and evaluating the progress of students of the target population.
• Multiyear analysis of following for the target student population and compared to other undergraduate students on campus:
   o Size and percent of the undergraduate enrollment trends,
   o First year persistence and year-over-year retention rates,
   o Completion rates by institution, and college/department,
   o Use of campus support services,
   o Percent of students that go on to graduate or professional school,
   o Job placement, and
   o Other metrics of success.
• Review of diversity in faculty and staff representation.
	1

In-depth analysis of qualitative measures including: • Inventory of academic and co-curricular programs and services provided specifically to target population students and/or used by target student populations as compared to the undergraduate population as a whole. • Incorporation of diverse perspectives and engagement among all students in course curriculum. • Resources and professional development opportunities provided to staff and faculty to better serve target population students. • Engagement with high impact practices by target group and population as a whole • Campus climate for target student population	**2**
Total	**4**

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 7: Student Access and Success

THEC

Student Access and Success: Focus Population Selection Form

The Student Access and Success standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to increase the percentage or number of graduates from select focus populations. An institution will select those focus populations particularly important to the institution's mission and will measure the graduation outcomes for those students. Institutions will select a total of **four** focus populations, one of which must be either African American, Hispanic or low-income students as these students are highlighted as critical in the Tennessee Higher Education Master Plan and see the most disparate postsecondary outcomes. Analysis will include data from the THEC Student Information System (SIS) of undergraduate technical certificates, associate degrees and bachelor's degrees only, unless otherwise noted as including graduate level degrees or alternative data source.

Please consider carefully as selections cannot be revised for the duration of the 2020-25 cycle.

Institution: _____

Institutions are required to select at LEAST one of the following.
Success for these populations is measured using Awards per 100 FTE methodology.
_____ African American
_____ Hispanic
_____ Low Income

Institutions may select up to three additional focus populations from those listed in the chart on page 2 or may propose a population for consideration by THEC staff. Please indicate the focus populations selected by your institution below. Please note self-reported data is subject to review by THEC staff.

_____
_____
_____

If your institution has proposed a unique population above, please complete the chart below.

Definition	
Justification	
Data Source	

If your institution has selected a geographic high needs area, based on the THEC 2020 County Profiles, please include a justification and list those counties included below.

Counties Included	Justification

Focus Populations

The calculation methodology is listed for each focus population. Whenever possible, an analysis of Awards per 100 FTE will be used to further emphasize the quality of support provided by institutions rather than the number of students enrolled.

Focus Populations by Calculation Method	
Percent Awards per 100 FTE	**Total Awards**
1. Academically Underprepared *(CC only)*	1. Associate Degree Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities *(CC only)*
2. African American	
3. First Generation*	2. Baccalaureate Degree Graduates with Previously Earned Associate Degree *(Univ only)*
4. Geographic High Need Area	
5. Historically Underserved Populations Graduate Degrees (Racial Minority or Low-Income)	3. High-Need Programs – Graduate Degrees*
6. Hispanic	4. High-Need Programs – Undergraduate Degrees*
7. Low-Income	
8. Males	
9. SPARC Counties*	
10. Veterans (self-reported) *	

* See notes below.

Notes:

Focus Population	Notes
First Generation	Graduates that report known parent(s) as not completing college. Data is from Institutional Student Information Record (ISIR) and includes only FASFA filing Tennesseans.
SPARC Counties	SPARC counties are those deemed [economically distressed or at risk](#) by Department of Economic and Community Development for the 2020 fiscal year. These 39 counties will not be updated during the 2020-25 cycle. **Distressed Counties**: Bledsoe, Clay, Cocke, Fentress, Grundy, Hancock, Hardeman, Jackson, Lake, Lauderdale, McNairy, Morgan, Perry, Scott, and Wayne. **At-Risk Counties:** Benton, Campbell, Carroll, Carter, Claiborne, Decatur, Grainger, Hardin, Hawkins, Haywood, Henderson, Houston, Johnson, Lewis, Meigs, Monroe, Obion, Overton, Rhea, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Warren, and Weakley.
Veterans	Institutions will include only service members. Dependents and survivors are excluded.
High-Need Programs	STEM and Health Professions graduates, as defined by federal 2020 CIP, along with highly STEM specialized multidisciplinary programs, with THEC CAO approval. (STEM CIPs: 01, 03, 11, 14, 15, 26, 27, and 40; Health Professions CIP: 31)

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding Cycle
Standard 7: Student Access and Success

⌢THEC

Student Access and Success: Awards per 100 FTE Methodology

The mission of QAF is to increase the quality of instruction and services provided to students. In the 2020-25 QAF cycle, calculations related to focus populations in the Student Access and Success standard be calculated based on awards percent per 100 FTE growth rather than headcount whenever possible. The shift in methodology seeks to decouple QAF from the number of graduates and focus on how well an institution serves enrolled students. In alignment with Outcomes Based Funding, Awards per 100 FTE is calculated for undergraduate students as unduplicated by degree type.

Institution	African Americans: Awards Per 100 FTE Calculation											
	2014-15			**2015-16**			**2016-17**			**2017-18**		
	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE
APSU	1,463	291	19.9	1,589	313	19.7	1,745	330	18.9	1,809	388	21.4
ETSU	666	110	16.5	713	121	17	689	116	16.8	738	111	15
MTSU	3,736	631	16.9	3,802	678	17.8	3,716	741	19.9	3,607	696	19.3
TSU	4,425	627	14.2	4,606	630	13.7	4,484	753	16.8	4,587	712	15.5
TTU	366	45	12.3	367	64	17.4	381	77	20.2	378	64	16.9
UOM	4,927	987	20	4,852	1,010	20.8	5,015	1,045	20.8	4,803	983	20.5
UTC	1,084	197	18.2	1,048	205	19.6	982	179	18.2	967	181	18.7
UTK	1,476	285	19.3	1,495	294	19.7	1,456	279	19.2	1,432	283	19.8
UTM	946	159	16.8	885	193	21.8	771	156	20.2	743	127	17.1
Univ Avg	**19,089**	**3,332**	**17.5**	**19,357**	**3,508**	**18.1**	**19,239**	**3,676**	**19.1**	**19,064**	**3,545**	**18.6**

African Americans: Awards Per 100 FTE Calculation											
Institution	2014-15			2015-16			2016-17			2017-18		
	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE	FTE	Awards	AP100FTE
ChSCC	837	133	15.9	737	134	18.2	639	134	21	594	131	22.1
ClSCC	143	32	22.4	125	28	22.4	120	29	24.1	107	35	32.7
CoSCC	255	50	19.6	251	40	15.9	261	39	14.9	283	48	16.9
DSCC	279	82	29.4	279	63	22.6	269	66	24.6	261	82	31.5
JSCC	435	80	18.4	434	63	14.5	421	73	17.3	436	65	14.9
MSCC	230	45	19.5	298	40	13.4	354	57	16.1	387	78	20.2
NaSCC	1,767	297	16.8	1,676	310	18.5	1,549	294	19	1,429	333	23.3
NeSCC	98	29	29.7	98	21	21.4	103	20	19.5	99	26	26.3
PSCC	459	81	17.6	443	91	20.6	400	85	21.3	462	117	25.4
RSCC	96	15	15.7	100	23	23	100	24	24.1	100	26	25.9
STCC	3,712	510	13.7	3,299	478	14.5	3,115	660	21.2	3,469	673	19.4
VSCC	435	86	19.8	490	91	18.6	468	107	22.9	497	96	19.3
WSCC	90	42	46.5	108	48	44.5	108	42	39	122	40	32.8
CC Avg	**8,836**	**1,482**	**16.8**	**8,338**	**1,430**	**17.2**	**7,907**	**1,630**	**20.6**	**8,246**	**1,750**	**21.2**

QAF Calculation Example

Below is an example of how awards per 100 FTE calculations will be analyzed for Quality Assurance Funding. The percent of awards per 100 FTE in a given year as compared to the three-year rolling average of the three years prior.

African American: Awards Per 100 FTE by Sector Average						
Sector	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	3 Yr Avg	2017-18	Percent
University	17.5	18.1	19.1	18.5	18.6	**101%**
Community College	15.8	17.2	20.6	17.9	21.2	**118%**