

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle
Scoring Sub-Committee**

***Meeting Agenda*
Wednesday, April 21, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. (CDST)
Conference Call**

Members

Karen Brunner

Roane State Community College

Patty Mulkeen

Austin Peay State University

Debbie McCarter

Walters State Community College

Mark Stephens

Tennessee Tech University

Michael McFall

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Ellen Weed

Nashville State Community College

Conference Call Numbers

THEC Conference Call Number: 1-866-531-9321 (pin number 5477)

Local number: 253-4881 (No pin required)

Discussion Items

- **General Education Assessment**
 - Institutional Improvement (5 points) and National Norm (10 points)
 - Remove option to switch test in mid-cycle
- **Accreditation**
 - Accreditation (5 points) – No recommended changes
- **Program Review/Academic Audit -- Undergraduate**
 - Frequency of Program Review
 - Embedded Certificates
 - Point Expansion 10 to 15 points (Scoring Table)
- **Program Review/Academic Audit -- Graduate (*forthcoming*)**

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Performance Funding 2010-15 Cycle
General Education Assessment: Institutional Improvement and National Norm Comparison

REVISED April 20, 2010

Institution	Test	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	3 Year Average	2008-09	% Institution to Avg	2010-15 Cycle: Improvement Points (5 pt max)	National Average	2008-09	% Institution to Nat'l Avg	2010-15 Cycle: Nat'l Norms (10 pt max)	2010-15 Cycle: Total (15 pt max)	2005-10 Cycle Pt	Difference
UT Chattanooga	CAAP	62.1	62.3	62.0	62.1	61.9	99.6%	5	61.8	61.9	100%	10	15	15	0
Jackson	CBase	275.0	275.0	274.0	274.7	276.0	100.5%	5	273.0	276.0	101%	10	15	15	0
Pellissippi	CBase	279.0	279.0	276.0	278.0	279.0	100.4%	5	273.0	279.0	102%	10	15	15	0
Southwest	CBase	243.0	239.0	247.0	243.0	243.0	100.0%	5	273.0	243.0	89%	6	11	10	1
Chattanooga	CCTST	16.1	15.9	15.4	15.8	15.8	100.0%	5	14.7	15.8	107%	10	15	15	0
Cleveland	CCTST	15.2	15.9	15.9	15.7	15.3	97.7%	4	14.7	15.3	104%	10	14	15	-1
Columbia	CCTST	14.9	15.2	15.4	15.2	15.6	102.7%	5	14.7	15.6	106%	10	15	15	0
Dyersburg	CCTST	15.6	15.4	15.1	15.4	15.6	101.6%	5	14.7	15.6	106%	10	15	15	0
Nashville	CCTST	14.6	14.7	14.8	14.7	15.1	102.6%	5	14.7	15.1	103%	10	15	15	0
East Tennessee	CCTST	17.5	17.4	17.7	17.5	17.2	98.1%	4	16.8	17.2	102%	10	14	15	-1
Middle Tennessee	CCTST			17.7	17.7	18.0	101.7%	5	16.8	18.0	107%	10	15	15	0
Tennessee Tech	CCTST	18.6	18.9	18.4	18.6	18.6	99.9%	5	16.8	18.6	111%	10	15	15	0
Univ of Memphis	CCTST	18.1	17.5	17.3	17.6	17.1	97.1%	4	16.8	17.1	102%	10	14	15	-1
UT Knoxville	CCTST	18.8	19.4	19.9	19.4	19.1	98.8%	4	16.8	19.1	114%	10	14	15	-1
Motlow	MAPP	440.6	443.7	443.3	442.5	442.7	100.0%	5	440.5	442.7	101%	10	15	15	0
Northeast	MAPP	443.6	440.5	442.5	442.2	442.0	100.0%	5	440.5	442.0	100%	10	15	15	0
Roane	MAPP	442.9	442.6	441.4	442.3	443.1	100.2%	5	440.5	443.1	101%	10	15	15	0
Volunteer	MAPP	441.8	442.6	443.7	442.7	441.9	99.8%	5	440.5	441.9	100%	10	15	15	0
Walters	MAPP	445.5	445.2	444.4	445.0	440.2	98.9%	4	440.5	440.2	100%	10	14	15	-1
Austin Peay	MAPP	446.8	446.5	446.0	446.4	445.2	99.7%	5	447.9	445.2	99%	9	14	14	0
UT Martin	MAPP	450.6	445.4	447.6	447.9	447.2	99.9%	5	447.9	447.2	100%	10	15	15	0
Middle Tennessee	MAPP	449.1	446.8												
Tennessee State	MAPP	438.6	435.3	432.7	435.5	435.2		5	450.8	435.2	97%	9	14	13	1

Performance Funding 2005-10 :General Education Scoring Table

% Institution to Nat'l Avg	Below 70%	70% to 71%	72% to 73%	74% to 75%	76% to 77%	78% to 79%	80% to 81%	82% to 83%	84% to 85%	86% to 88%	89% to 91%	92% to 93%	94% to 95%	96% to 97%	98% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15

Performance Funding 2010-15: General Education -- National Norm Comparison Scoring Table

% Institution to Nat'l Avg	Below 70%	70% to 74%	75% to 78%	79% to 81%	82% to 84%	85% to 87%	88% to 90%	91% to 93%	94% to 96%	97% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Performance Funding 2010-15: General Education -- Internal Comparison Scoring Table

% Institution to Trend	Below 74%	75% to 81%	82% to 87%	88% to 93%	94% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Number of Mature Non-Accreditable Programs and Frequency of Program Review/Academic Audit
2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle

Frequency of Program Review/Academic Audit

- Less than 50 academic programs – 5 years
- 50+ programs – 7 years
- 100+ programs – 10 years

2005 Carnegie Classification	Institution	2005-10 Review Cycle	2010-15 Review Cycle	Undergraduate Programs	Graduate Programs	Total Programs	Number of Programs Evaluated Annually
Research Very High	UT Knoxville	10 year	10 year	36	74	110	11
Research University High	Univ of Memphis	7 year	7 year	25	32	57	8
Master's Large	Middle Tennessee	5 year	7 year	30	22	52	10
Doctoral Research	East Tennessee	5 year	5 year	24	21	45	9
Master's Medium	Austin Peay	5 year	5 year	27	8	35	7
Doctoral Research	Tennessee State	5 year	5 year	19	13	32	6
Master's Large	UT Chattanooga	5 year	5 year	21	10	31	6
Master's Large	Tennessee Tech	5 year	5 year	16	14	30	6
Master's Medium	UT Martin	5 year	5 year	19	2	21	4

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Number of Mature Non-Accreditable Programs and Frequency of Program Review/Academic Audit
2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle

Frequency of Program Review/Academic Audit

- Less than 50 academic programs – 5 years
- 50+ programs – 7 years
- 100+ programs – 10 years

2005 Carnegie Classification	Institution	Review Cycle	Total Embedded and Free Standing Certificate and Associate Degree Programs	Number of Programs Evaluated Annually
Associate	Chattanooga	5 year	18	4
Associate	Cleveland	5 year	12	2
Associate	Columbia	5 year	11	2
Associate	Dyersburg	5 year	9	2
Associate	Jackson	5 year	8	2
Associate	Moltow	5 year	10	2
Associate	Nashville	5 year	22	4
Associate	Northeast	5 year	18	4
Associate	Pellissippi	5 year	12	2
Associate	Roane	5 year	13	3
Associate	Southwest	5 year	26	5
Associate	Volunteer	5 year	11	2
Associate	Walters	5 year	13	3

- Individual embedded certificate will be exempt from conducting a separate program review/academic audit but rather the evaluation of the embedded certificate be incorporated into the review of the degree program in which it is contained.
- If the degree program in which it is contained is accredited by an approved agency and in good standing, then the embedded certificate is exempted from the program review/academic audit.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding Template**

Nashville State Community College

Embedded Certificate/Associate Programs

	2000 CIP	Program	Degree
1	06.11.0801.00	WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP)	2.3 AAS
	06.11.0801.00	WEB PAGE AUTHORIZING (RODP)	2.2 C1
2	07.12.0503.00	CULINARY ARTS	2.1 C1
	07.12.0503.00	CULINARY SCIENCE	2.3 AAS
3	12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.1 C1
	12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3 AAS
4	31.51.0701.00	HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT	2.3 AAS
	31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL CODING	2.2 C1
	31.51.0708.00	MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION	2.2 C1
5	32.52.0203.00	LOGISTICS	2.1 C1
	32.52.0203.00	LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
	32.52.0203.01	TRANSPORTATION	2.1 C1
	32.52.0203.02	SUPPLY CHAIN	2.1 C1
6	32.52.0302.00	ACCOUNTING TECHNOLOGY	2.2 C1
	32.52.0302.01	COMPUTER ACCOUNTING	2.3 AAS
7	32.52.0401.00	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	2.2 C1
	32.52.0401.00	OFFICE ADMINISTRATION	2.3 AAS

Free-Standing Certificate Programs

	2000 CIP	Program	Degree
8	01.01.0605.00	HORTICULTURE & LAND. GARDENING	2.1 C1
9	09.15.1301.00	COMPUTER-AIDED DRAFTING	2.2 C1
10	29.46.0302.00	INDUSTRIAL ELECT MAINTENANCE	2.2 C1
11	30.50.0409.00	3D DESIGN AND GRAPHICS	2.2 C1
12	30.50.0605.00	PHOTOGRAPHY	2.1 C1
13	30.50.0999.01	MUSIC TECHNOLOGY	2.2 C1
14	31.51.0909.00	SURGICAL TECHNOLOGY	2.2 C1

Free Standing Associate Degree Programs

	2000 CIP	Program	Degree
15	06.11.0901.00	COMPUTER NETWORK TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
16	08.13.0101.00	TEACHING	2.3 AST
17	09.15.0000.00	ARCH, CIVIL & CONSTRU ENG TECH	2.3 AAS
18	09.15.0303.01	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING TECH	2.3 AAS
19	09.15.0613.00	INDUSTRIAL PROCESS CONTROL TEC	2.3 AAS
20	09.15.1202.00	COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
21	10.16.1603.00	SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETING	2.3 AAS
22	13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
23	14.22.0302.00	PARALEGAL STUDIES	2.3 AAS
24	16.24.0101.01	UNIVERSITY PARALLEL	2.3 AA, AS
25	16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3 AAS
26	27.43.0107.00	POLICE SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
27	27.44.0201.00	SOCIAL SERVICES	2.3 AAS
28	29.47.0604.00	AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	2.3 AAS
29	30.50.0402.00	VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS	2.3 AAS
30	31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSIST	2.3 AAS
31	31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3 AAS
32	32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	2.3 AAS
33	32.52.1201.00	COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.3 AAS

Bold font indicates accredited program

Red font indicates new creditable program that has not achieved accreditation.

Embedded certificate is defined as a technical certificate with the following characteristics: (1) approved by TBR and/or THEC; (2) certificate whose curriculum, content and requirements are contained with the great requirements of a related associate degree program; (3) certificate for which the related degree assumes responsibility for quality control and assurance; and (4) certificate that may be earned as a defined step towards earning an associate degree and thus may serve as an incentive for earning that degree.

- Individual embedded certificate will be exempt from conducting a separate program review/academic audit but rather the evaluation of the embedded certificate be incorporated into the review of the degree program in which it is contained.
- If the degree program in which it is contained is accredited by an approved agency and in good standing, then the embedded certificate is exempted from the program review/academic audit.

Nashville State Community College

- 43 academic programs
- 33 embedded programs
- 22 embedded and free standing certificate and Associate degree programs (non-accreditable)

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Non-Accreditable Undergraduate Programs
Scoring Table Comparison: Performance Funding Cycles 2005-10 and 2010-15**

	2005-06	2005-10 5 pt Max	2010-15 10 pt Max	2006-07	2005-10 5 pt Max	2010-15 10 pt Max	2007-08	2005-10 5 pt Max	2010-15 10 pt Max	2008-09	2005-10 5 pt Max	2010-15 10 pt Max
Austin Peay	93%	5	7	95%	5	8	94%	All institutions earned the maximum 5 points	8	94%	All institutions earned the maximum 5 points	8
East Tennessee	93%	5	7	97%	5	8	98%		9	98%		9
Middle Tennessee	99%	5	9	100%	5	10	99%		9	99%		9
Tennessee State	83%	4	4	92%	5	7	94%		8	94%		8
Tennessee Tech	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	95%		8	97%		9
Univ of Memphis	93%	5	7	95%	5	8	95%		8	95%		8
UT Chattanooga	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	100%		10	98%		9
UT Knoxville	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	99%		9	100%		10
UT Martin	98%	5	9	87%	4	5	91%		7	91%		7
Chattanooga	85%	4	5	93%	5	7	91%	All institutions earned the maximum 5 points	7	95%	All institutions earned the maximum 5 points	8
Cleveland	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	96%		8	96%		8
Columbia	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	100%		10	100%		10
Dyersburg	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	100%		10	100%		10
Jackson	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	98%		9	99%		9
Motlow	100%	5	10	96%	5	8	98%		9	99%		9
Nashville	100%	5	10	92%	5	7	95%		8	95%		8
Northeast	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	100%		10	100%		10
Pellissippi	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	100%		10	98%		9
Roane	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	99%		9	100%		10
Southwest	15%	0	0	79%	3	3	92%		7	94%		8
Volunteer	100%	5	10	100%	5	10	95%		8	97%		9
Walters	100%	5	10	95%	5	8	97%		9	98%		9

2005-10 PF Cycle: Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Undergraduate Programs

Successful Standards	Below 50%	50% to 60%	61% to 70%	71% to 80%	81% to 90%	91% to 100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5

2010-15 PF Cycle: Proposed Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Undergraduate Programs

% Successful Standards	Below 70%	70% to 74%	75% to 78%	79% to 81%	82% to 84%	85% to 87%	88% to 90%	91% to 93%	94% to 96%	97% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Standard One – Student Learning and Engagement

1C: Accreditation and Program Review/Academic Audit

Points: 15 points for community colleges and 25 points for universities

Purpose: This assessment indicator is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation.

Evaluation: For those programs that are accreditable, evaluation will be based on the percentage of eligible programs which are accredited. For those programs that are non-accreditable, evaluation will be based on a set of objective standards. All institutions with the exception of **Middle Tennessee State University**, University of Memphis and UT Knoxville must evaluate each non-accreditable program at least once during the five year performance funding cycle. Middle Tennessee State University and University of Memphis are required to evaluate their programs on a seven-year cycle. UT Knoxville will evaluate their programs on a 10-year cycle.

Frequency of Program Review/Academic Audit

- Less than 50 academic programs – 5 years
- 50+ programs – 7 years
- 100+ programs – 10 years

Accreditation:

1. Only programs which appear on the Tennessee Higher Education Commission's Academic Program Inventory are eligible under this standard. Options and concentrations are not covered under this standard, even if separately accredited.
2. A program is defined as eligible for the accreditation aspect of this indicator if there is a recognized agency which accredits programs for that field and degree level. Commission staff will maintain a list of approved accrediting agencies. The Commission reserves the right to determine if program accreditation is consonant with institutional mission and/or the state master plan for higher education.
3. Institutions or groups of institutions may petition the Commission through their respective governing boards to add or delete accrediting agencies from the approved list located in Appendix C. An agency may be added or deleted upon affirmation from a majority of the institutions affected by the nominated agency. If an accrediting agency is added to the approved list, current programs impacted by this decision will be exempt from achieving accreditation during the 2010-15 cycle. If an accrediting agency is removed from the list and the program accreditation expires before the 2010-15 cycle ends, the academic program will be subject to peer review during the 2010-15 cycle.
4. All academic programs should be considered for **accreditation**, unless they meet the following exceptions:
 - Have been approved by the Commission for fewer than three years for pre-baccalaureate programs and fewer than five years for baccalaureate and graduate programs, unless the program is accredited by a recognized agency;
 - Have been terminated or are being phased out by governing board action;
 - Have been placed on "inactive" status by the governing board;

- Appropriate accrediting agency does not exist;
 - Have obstacles to accreditation because of program organization or curriculum.
5. Each institution will submit to the governing boards and Commission documentation in support of all accredited programs by **October 15, 2010**.
 6. Proposals for changes in the eligibility of accredited programs must be submitted to Commission staff by January 1 of each year of the cycle.
 7. If multiple programs are accredited by a single agency, each program counts separately for this indicator.
 8. A program eligible for accreditation by more than one agency will be counted only once for this indicator, although all accreditation must be reported so that the Commission can maintain accurate accreditation information.

Scoring – Accreditation:

The number of accredited programs will be divided by the total number of accreditable programs to calculate the overall accreditation percentage. This percentage is used to generate points for this standard based on Table 3 Accreditation.

Table 3: Accreditation Scoring Table

Percent Accredited	Below 74%	75% to 81%	82% to 87%	88% to 93%	94% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5

Processes – Program Review:

1. All non-accreditable certificate and degree programs must be evaluated through the traditional program review or Academic Audit. The only exception is for non-accreditable programs that are in phase-out or inactive status at the beginning of the cycle. If a program becomes become inactive during the cycle, the scheduled program shall also be exempt. Institutions shall have the flexibility in determining which evaluation method is most suitable for the program review process.
2. The traditional program review must be conducted by at least one qualified out-of-state external reviewer. Selection of reviewers is subject to review by governing boards and Commission staff. The Academic Audit process must be conducted by the guidelines established by the Tennessee Board of Regents.
3. All programs approved by THEC as of November 2009 will be reviewed during the 2010-15 cycle. New programs approved after January 2010 and reaching program maturity during the 2010-15 cycle must be evaluated through program review. Program maturity for certificate and associate degree programs is defined as a three year period after implementation; program maturity for baccalaureate and graduate programs is a five year period after implementation. Prior to program maturity, new programs are subject to the annual Post-Approval Monitoring guidelines as set forth in THEC Academic Policy A1.1 for Academic Proposals.
4. Each institution will notify the board and Commission of its cycle of evaluations for all non-accreditable programs by **October 15, 2010**. This schedule must coincide with the five year Performance Funding cycle. Furthermore, all institutions with the exception

of University of Memphis and UT Knoxville are required to review approximately 20% of their non-accreditable programs per year. **Middle Tennessee State University** and University of Memphis are required to review approximately 15% of their non-accreditable programs per year. UT Knoxville is required to review 10% of their non-accreditable programs per year.

5. Scoring will be cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the cycle.
6. For each non-accreditable program reviewed through the traditional peer review process, the completed summary evaluation sheet, narrative report and vitas of the external reviewer(s) must be included with the institution’s performance funding reporting template.
7. For each non-accreditable program reviewed using the Academic Audit process, the completed summary evaluation sheet, narrative report and list of audit team members must be included with the institution’s performance funding template. THEC reserves the right to request additional documentation related to accreditation and program review as needed.
8. 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 governing board and Commission staff by January 1 of the reporting year.
- 9. REMINDER – Include information regarding EMBEDDED CERTIFICATES.**

Scoring for Non-Accreditable Undergraduate Programs:

For non-accreditable undergraduate programs, scoring is accomplished by dividing the total number of successful standards met by the total number of scored standards, excluding those judged “Not Applicable.” The resulting percentage will be applied to Table 4 to award points.

Table 4: Non-Accreditable Undergraduate Programs

% Successful Standards	Below 70%	70% to 74%	75% to 78%	79% to 81%	82% to 84%	85% to 87%	88% to 90%	91% to 93%	94% to 96%	97% to 99%	100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Graduate Program Review/Academic Academic – TO BE UPDATED TO REFLECT 10 points

Scoring for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs – Traditional Program Review

Graduate programs using the traditional program review are evaluated in two parts: (1) objective standards and (2) qualitative standards. The objective standards are scored by averaging the objective standards met for all programs being evaluated. The resulting value is compared to Table 5 to determine the points awarded.

Table 5: Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs - Objective Standard

Average Objective Standards Met	0, 1 or 2	3 or 4	5	6	7	8
Points	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5

The qualitative standards are scored by averaging the qualitative scores for all programs being evaluated. The resulting value is compared to Table 6 to determine the points awarded.

Table 6: Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs - Qualitative Standard

Average Qualitative Standards Met	Below 1	1 to 1.4	1.5 to 1.8	1.9 to 2.3	2.4 to 2.7	2.8 and Above
Points	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5

The points awarded from the two tables above are summed to obtain the total points awarded for this indicator.

Scoring for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs – Academic Audit

Effective 2008-09, the Academic Audit is provided as an option for evaluating graduate programs. For non-accreditable graduate programs using the Academic Audit, scoring is accomplished by dividing the total number of successful standards met by the total number of scored standards, excluding those judged “Not Applicable.” The resulting percentage will be applied to Table 6A to award points.

Table 6A: Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs – Academic Audit

Successful Standards	Below 50%	50% to 60%	61% to 70%	71% to 80%	81% to 90%	91% to 100%
Points	0	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs – Traditional Program Review and Academic Audit

For non-accreditable graduate programs using either the traditional program review or Academic Audit, the scoring process recognizes each program as one incidence cumulatively. Each program is weighted equally in computing the overall points requested. The point requested formula reference the respective tables for the program review objective score (Table 5), program review qualitative score (Table 6), and the Academic Audit percentage of criteria met score (Table 6A). After the overall point score is determined (based on the three tables), Table 6B places the score at the next or same 0.5 interval.

Table 6B: Points Requested for Traditional Program Review and Academic Audit

Score	0	0.1 - 0.5	0.6 - 1.0	1.1 - 1.5	1.6 - 2.0	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0	3.1 - 3.5	3.6 - 4.0	4.1 - 4.5	4.6 - 5.0
Points	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0

References:

- Appendix C – Accrediting Agencies
- Appendix D – Assessment of Certificate and Associate Programs
- Appendix E – Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs
- Appendix F – Assessment of Graduate Programs
- Appendix G – Academic Audit Checklist
- Appendix G1 – Academic Audit Checklist Graduate Programs
- Appendix H – Academic Proposals (THEC Academic Policy A1.1)