

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

*Meeting Agenda*  
**Wednesday, May 26, 2010**  
**10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. (CDST)**

**Members**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Karen Brunner<br>Roane State Community College       | Patty Mulkeen<br>Austin Peay State University   |
| Debbie McCarter<br>Walters State Community College   | Mark Stephens<br>Tennessee Tech University      |
| Michael McFall<br>University of Tennessee, Knoxville | Ellen Weed<br>Nashville State Community College |

**Conference Call Numbers**

THEC Conference Call Number: 1-866-531-9322 (pin number 5214)  
Local number: 253-4882 (No pin required)

**Discussion Items**

- **Graduate Program Review (point increase from 5 to 10)**
  - Program Review
    - 2005-10 Cycle: Objective Standards and Qualitative Standards
    - 2010-15 Cycle: Qualitative Standards Only

|                |        |         |         |          |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|----------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Average</b> | 0 - .2 | .3 - .5 | .6 - .8 | .9 - 1.1 | 1.2 - 1.4 | 1.5 - 1.7 | 1.8 - 2.0 | 2.1 - 2.3 | 2.4 - 2.6 | 2.7 - 2.8 | 2.9 - 3.0 |
| <b>Points</b>  | 0      | 1       | 2       | 3        | 4         | 5         | 6         | 7         | 8         | 9         | 10        |

- Academic Audit (*Randy Schulte*)
  - 2010-15 Cycle: Category 14 (Follow-Up of Previous Academic Audit)

|                               |           |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |             |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>% Successful Standards</b> | Below 71% | 72% to 74% | 75% to 77% | 78% to 80% | 81% to 83% | 84% to 86% | 87% to 89% | 90% to 92% | 93% to 95% | 96% to 98% | 99% to 100% |
| <b>Points</b>                 | 0         | 1          | 2          | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          | 7          | 8          | 9          | 10          |

- **New Major Field Test Construction Plan (*Michael McFall*)**

**STANDARDS/SCORING RUBRIC TO BE FINALIZED**

- Assessment Implementation: Primary Trait Analysis (Scoring Rubric)
- Comprehensive Satisfaction Studies Report: Primary Trait Analysis (Scoring Rubric)
- Degree Productivity: Student Subpopulations (Formula Review Committee)

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

|                  | 2005-06<br>Qualitative<br>Score | 2005-10<br>Max 5 pt | 2010-15<br>Max 10 pt | 2006-07<br>Qualitative<br>Score | 2005-10<br>Max 5 pt | 2010-15<br>Max 10 pt | 2007-08<br>Qualitative<br>Score | 2005-10<br>Max 5 pt | 2010-15<br>Max 10 pt | 2008-09<br>Qualitative<br>Score | 2005-10<br>Max 5 pt | 2010-15<br>Max 10 pt |
|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Austin Peay      | --                              | 3.5                 |                      | 2.4                             | 4.0                 | 8                    | 2.3                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.3                             | 4.5                 | 7                    |
| East Tennessee   | 2.8                             | 5.0                 | 9                    | 2.6                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.6                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.5                             | 5.0                 | 8                    |
| Middle Tennessee | 2.5                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.4                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.5                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.5                             | 4.5                 | 8                    |
| Tennessee State  | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.3                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    |
| Tennessee Tech   | 2.8                             | 5.0                 | 9                    | 2.8                             | 5.0                 | 9                    | 2.6                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.6                             | 4.5                 | 8                    |
| Univ of Memphis  | 2.0                             | 5.0                 | 6                    | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    | 2.2                             | 4.0                 | 7                    |
| UT Chattanooga   | 3.0                             | 5.0                 | 10                   | 2.9                             | 5.0                 | 10                   | 2.9                             | 5.0                 | 10                   | 2.9                             | 5.0                 | 10                   |
| UT Knoxville     | 2.7                             | 4.5                 | 9                    | 2.8                             | 4.5                 | 9                    | 2.5                             | 4.5                 | 8                    | 2.5                             | 4.5                 | 8                    |
| UT Martin        | 2.8                             | 5.0                 | 9                    | 2.7                             | 5.0                 | 9                    | 2.7                             | 4.5                 | 9                    | 2.8                             | 5.0                 | 9                    |

**2005-10 PF Cycle: Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs: Objective Standards**

| 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 |

**2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle Academic Audit – 8 Graduate Programs**

- 2007-08 – Academic Audit Pilot (ETSU)
- 2008-09
  - APSU (2 programs) – 91% standards met
  - ETSU (2 programs) – 99% standards met
- 2009-10
  - APSU (2 programs)
  - ETSU (1 program)

**2005-10 PF Cycle: Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs: Qualitative Standards**

| 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           |

**2010-15 PF Cycle: Proposed Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs: Program Review**

| Average | 0-.2 | .3-.5 | .6-.8 | .9-1.1 | 1.2-1.4 | 1.5-1.7 | 1.8-2.0 | 2.1-2.3 | 2.4-2.6 | 2.7-2.8 | 2.9-3.0 |
|---------|------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Points  | 0    | 1     | 2     | 3      | 4       | 5       | 6       | 7       | 8       | 9       | 10      |

**2010-15 PF Cycle: Proposed Scoring Table for Non-Accreditable Graduate Programs: Academic Audit**

| % Successful Standards | Below 71% | 72% to 74% | 75% to 77% | 78% to 80% | 81% to 83% | 84% to 86% | 87% to 89% | 90% to 92% | 93% to 95% | 96% to 98% | 99% to 100% |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Points                 | 0         | 1          | 2          | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          | 7          | 8          | 9          | 10          |

Same scoring table as undergraduate program



2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle
Appendix G: Program Review -- Graduate Programs

Instructions for External Reviewers:

In accordance with the 2010-15 Performance Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes either an external peer review or academic audit according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Checklist for Assessment of Graduate Programs." The Checklist consists of 20 criteria grouped into four categories. THEC will use the criteria designated with an asterisk (\*) to assess standards in the graduate programs.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a Self Study document. Supporting documents will be available 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 complete the checklist and prepare the narrative report. Items on the checklist should be rated on a four-point scale ranging from "poor" to "excellent" (or N/A for items which are not applicable to the program).

This evaluation becomes a part of the record of the academic program review. The checklist will be shared with the department, the 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 checklist will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Your judgment of the criteria designated by an asterisk on this form will be used in allocating state funds for the university's budget.

Name, Title, and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s):

Form with two columns for reviewer information. Labels include Name, Title, Institution, Signature, and Date.

## Checklist for Assessment of Graduate Programs

**Institution:**

**Program Title(s):**

**Degree Designation(s) and CIP Code:**

|  | N/A | Poor | Minimally Acceptable | Good | Excellent |
|--|-----|------|----------------------|------|-----------|
| <b>A. Student Experience</b>   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 1 There is a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 2 Prudence is exercised in the number and type of short courses accepted toward the degree.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 3 Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 4 There are adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 5 There are adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication. |     |      |                      |      |           |
| <b>B. Graduate Faculty Quality</b>   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 1 Faculty hold terminal degrees in the appropriate discipline.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 2 Faculty academic credentials correspond to the concentrations in which they teach.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 3 Faculty scholarly activity is sufficient to serve as effective mentors for graduate students   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 4 Faculty have sufficient practical/professional/academic experience to serve as effective mentors for graduate students.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 5 Faculty have regular opportunities for professional development, including travel and participation in professional organizations, workshops and other learning activities.                            |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 6 Faculty teaching loads are consonant with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| <b>C. Teaching/Learning Environment</b>  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 1 There are ample materials and secretarial support to encourage research and publication.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 2 There is adequate library support.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 3 There is adequate and accessible computer support.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| 4 There are adequate lab facilities.   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| 5 There is adequate office space.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| <b>D. Program Evaluation</b>   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 1 Follow-up data on graduating students are regularly and systematically collected   |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 2 The curriculum is evaluated periodically.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 3 Evaluation of placement of graduates is regular and systematic.  |     |      |                      |      |           |
| * 4 Completion rates are at an acceptable level.   |     |      |                      |      |           |



| Academic Audit Summary Sheet              |   |                           |                |
|---|---|---------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Institution:</b>                       |   | <b>Evaluation Results</b> |                |
| <b>Program Title(s):</b>                  |   |                           |                |
| <b>Degree Level(s):</b>                   |   |                           |                |
| <b>CIP Code(s):</b>                       |   |                           |                |
| <b>1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES</b>             |   | <b>Met</b>                | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 1.1                                       | The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for developing learning objectives for the program, considering measurability, clarity and what students need to know.  |                           |                |
| 1.2                                       | The faculty documented or proposed a process for developing learning objectives that are based on realistic and appropriate evidence.   |                           |                |
| 1.3                                       | The faculty documented or proposed specific plans to take best practices and appropriate benchmarks into account in the analysis of learning objectives.  |                           |                |
| 1.4                                       | The faculty clearly communicates program objectives to current and potential students, employers or other stakeholders.   |                           |                |
| <b>2. CURRICULUM AND CO-CURRICULUM</b>    |   | <b>Met</b>                | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 2.1                                       | The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of the extent to which they collaborate effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements which will reflect attained competencies in the outcome data.   |                           |                |
| 2.2                                       | The faculty documented or proposed a plan for analyzing the content, format and sequencing of courses in terms of achieving program learning objectives with appropriate breadth and depth for the degree offered which allows for attainment of the degree in a timely manner. |                           |                |
| 2.3                                       | The faculty documented or proposed a plan for determining the soundness of and rationale for curriculum and co-curriculum based on appropriate evidence, including comparison with best practices where appropriate, and communicate these views to the student body.           |                           |                |
| <b>3. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES</b> |   | <b>Met</b>                | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 3.1                                       | The faculty examined the extent to which there is focus on and periodic, systematic review of the actual process of teaching and learning throughout the program.   |                           |                |
| 3.2                                       | The faculty documented or proposed a plan that promotes the effective use of instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.  |                           |                |
| 3.3                                       | The faculty analyzed the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in the design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program with reliance on best practices and resources beyond the confines of the program or department.                  |                           |                |
| 3.4                                       | There is a critical mass of faculty and students to promote a scholarly community and assure an appropriate group of peers.   |                           |                |
| 3.5                                       | Faculty /graduate student ratio, average course load, average thesis/dissertation load per faculty and distribution across department, and teaching evaluations evidence support of graduate teaching and learning processes.   |                           |                |
| 3.6                                       | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to inform students of course offerings and the provision of professional development activities and relevant courses to supplement departmental offerings in a timely fashion.  |                           |                |

|                                       |   |            |                |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------|----------------|
| 3.7                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to ensure that all students are adequately oriented, advised, mentored and socialized within the discipline and the larger graduate community.  |            |                |
| <b>4. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT</b> |   | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 4.1                                   | The faculty documented or proposed indicators of student learning success that are keyed to the learning objectives of the program.   |            |                |
| 4.2                                   | The faculty documented or proposed assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices and appropriate comparisons.   |            |                |
| 4.3                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a periodically and systematically reviewed plan for using student learning assessments that leads to continuous improvements in the program.   |            |                |
| 4.4                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.  |            |                |
| <b>5. QUALITY ASSURANCE</b>           |   | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 5.1                                   | There is an evident commitment to making continuous quality improvements in the program (e.g., student advisement and mentoring, use of best practices, recognition of faculty performance, regular and systematic evaluation of student performance) a top priority. |            |                |
| 5.2                                   | The faculty documented or proposed ways to ensure that quality assurance will be a systematic and regular process for program improvement.  |            |                |
| 5.3                                   | The coursework offers sufficient breadth and depth appropriate for the degree offered.  |            |                |
| 5.4                                   | The faculty are documented to hold terminal degrees in the discipline in which they teach and have experience sufficient to serve as effective mentors for graduate students.   |            |                |
| 5.5                                   | Data on current students and follow-up data on graduating students including placement data are regularly and systematically collected.   |            |                |
| <b>6. RESEARCH OUTCOMES</b>           |   | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 6.1                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to ensure that there is a commitment to matching or exceeding comparable institutions in research activities.   |            |                |
| 6.2                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to assure sufficient depth and breadth in faculty research expertise to enable competitiveness in the external funding arena while allowing for collaboration when desired.   |            |                |
| <b>7. RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT</b>        |   | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 7.1                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to ensure a commitment to communicate the program's research environment, research values and priorities.   |            |                |
| 7.2                                   | The faculty candidly and thoroughly examined the extent to which the department describes itself accurately and completely to current and prospective students and other "publics".   |            |                |
| 7.3                                   | The department takes active steps to support both junior and senior faculty in remaining vital in their respective research areas.  |            |                |
| 7.4                                   | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to ensure that departmental processes, policies and procedures positively influence faculty research activities and program competitiveness.  |            |                |

|  |  |            |                |
|--|--|------------|----------------|
| 7.5  | The faculty documented or proposed a plan that engages graduate students in inquiry and research in collaboration with faculty.  |            |                |
| <b>8. SYNERGY WITH EDUCATION</b>                                       |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 8.1  | The faculty documented or proposed a plan that honestly evaluates departmental resource demands in light of departmental research and scholarship's contribution to its educational programs and the mission of the department, college and university.  |            |                |
| 8.2  | There is a commitment to activities designed to keep the faculty and students informed on contemporary issues related to research (e.g., lecture series, responsible conduct of research workshops, professional development activities).  |            |                |
| 8.3  | The program demonstrates best practices in integrating the science with the practice of the discipline.  |            |                |
| 8.4  | The faculty candidly and thoroughly evaluated the extent to which they incorporate research into the educational programs in support of best practices.  |            |                |
| 8.5  | The program demonstrates best practices in addressing workload demands of theses and dissertations supervision.  |            |                |
| <b>9. SPONSORED PROGRAMS</b>   |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 9.1  | The faculty documented and proposed a plan to strive for sponsored research funding at comparable levels with other comparable departments within the institution and across peer institutions.  |            |                |
| 9.2  | The faculty documented or proposed a plan to assure that faculty are consistently informed of external funding opportunities as well as the availability of assistance in areas such as proposal writing and project management.   |            |                |
| <b>10. QUALITY AND PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS</b>                         |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 10.1   | There are appropriate indices endorsed by the program faculty as means to gauge faculty quality and productivity.  |            |                |
| 10.2   | The faculty documented or proposed ways to ensure that quality research and productivity will be systematically and regularly examined across the faculty lifespan.  |            |                |
| 10.3   | The culminating experience required by the program both in terms of comprehensive examination and/or research allows the student to demonstrate the breadth, depth and integration of the disciplinary coursework and experiences with the demonstration of communication skills and the ability to apply knowledge independently. |            |                |
| <b>11. CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROGRAM, DEPARTMENTAL AND UNIVERSITY GOALS</b> |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| 11.1   | There is a process in place which is communicated to other levels of the institution that evaluates the sufficiency of resources in place to meet the teaching responsibilities while actively engaging in research with graduate students and undergraduates.   |            |                |
| 11.2   | The faculty documented and proposed a plan to encourage and support research outcomes congruent with the department's purpose and the university mission.  |            |                |
| 11.3   | The faculty clearly state and embrace appropriate admission standards, completion standards and graduation rates which are readily available to prospective and current students.  |            |                |

|   |  |            |                |
|---|--|------------|----------------|
| <b>12. OVERALL ASSESSMENT</b>                   |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| <b>12.1</b>                                     | The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.   |            |                |
| <b>12.2</b>                                     | The Academic Audit process (self-study and visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes.  |            |                |
| <b>12.3</b>                                     | The process resulted in a candid description of weaknesses in program processes and suggestions for improvements.  |            |                |
| <b>12.4</b>                                     | Overall, the visiting team affirms the openness and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.  |            |                |
| <b>13. SUPPORT</b>                              |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| <b>13.1</b>                                     | The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.   |            |                |
| <b>13.2</b>                                     | The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.  |            |                |
| <b>13.3</b>                                     | The operating budget is sufficient to attract quality students and provides adequate support without substantially delaying progress toward the degree.  |            |                |
| <b>13.4</b>                                     | The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.  |            |                |
| <b>13.5</b>                                     | The operating budget is sufficient to allow faculty regular opportunities for professional development including travel and presentation of research findings, participation in professional organizations, workshops and other learning activities. |            |                |
| <b>14. FOLLOW-UP OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC AUDIT</b> |  | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
| <b>14.1</b>                                     | An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.   |            |                |
| <b>14.2</b>                                     | There is documented evidence that Recommendations made by the Academic Auditor Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.  |            |                |
| <b>14.3</b>                                     | There is documented evidence that the program has implemented and tracked the progress of and use of results from Improvement Initiatives cited by the faculty in its self study.  |            |                |



## The Locally Developed Test

Another option available to departments, and one that many prefer, is to develop their own assessment tools. There are both advantages and disadvantages to using a locally developed test. Using such a test allows for the major field assessment instrument to relate directly to current curricula. However, departments must invest time into maintaining such an instrument between test administrations. In addition, there are considerable time commitments and planning that must occur if a department is developing a new local test.


Similar to a locally developed test, departments may choose to use a capstone course or a culminating project as an assessment of the major. Though this enables a department to use a pre-established measure, it still requires a time commitment in development and maintenance.

If a department chooses to use a locally developed instrument to assess the major, then there are some guidelines that must be followed. When reusing an existing test, departments are permitted to alter approximately 20% of the test without penalty. In fact, such revisions are encouraged and recommended. This small change ensures continuity and comparability of results while allowing for changes in curriculum that may occur between test administrations.

If the changes to an existing test exceed 20% or if a department has decided to develop a new local test, there are additional rules and deadlines that must be followed:

1. First and foremost, planning for a new locally developed test should ideally begin in the summer or early fall semester of the Planning Year (or one year prior to the test administration year).
2. During the planning phase, a proposal, including methodology, is written. This proposal needs to be submitted to both the governing board and Commission staff for prior approval.
3. While the proposal is being reviewed, the department should begin securing external consultants to review the test. THEC requires that all new, locally developed tests are reviewed by either two out-of-state specialists in the discipline or by one out-of-state discipline specialist and one measurement consultant.
4. After completing the reviews and all updates/changes have been made, the department needs to forward copies of the following to the campus performance funding coordinator for filing and for forwarding to THEC:
  - A copy of each consultant's vita,
  - Copies of all correspondence to and from the consultants related to the review,
  - Copies of both the test proposal and the test itself.
5. In the spring semester of the Planning Year, the department must establish a baseline for the test. This will provide a basis for comparison during the actual administration of the test.
6. Following the baseline administration, the test scores should also be forwarded to the campus performance funding coordinator.

Below is a general timeline for those using a locally developed instrument.

| Timeline  | Action   |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>During the Planning Year...</b><br/><i>Summer/Fall Semesters</i></p> <p><i>Spring Semester</i></p> <p><b>During the Testing Year...</b></p> | <p><b>Developing a new test</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write test proposal and submit to THEC</li> <li>• Write test itself</li> <li>• Secure 2 external consultants to review proposal and test</li> <li>• Send copies of all materials to campus performance funding coordinator</li> </ul> <p>• Make corrections to test</p> <p>• Baseline administration</p> <p>• Send baseline scores to OIRA for comparison use</p> <p>• Test all graduating seniors from fall and spring terms</p> | <p><b>Reusing an existing test</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the previous version of the test</li> <li>• Make necessary revisions to the test (<i>note: if more than 20% of the test is revised, then the department must treat the test as a new locally developed test and complete the review and baseline process.</i>)</li> </ul> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test all graduating seniors from fall and spring terms</li> </ul> |

**Plan for Creating a Locally-Developed  
Major Field Testing Assessment Instrument  
2010-15 Performance Funding Cycle**

---

**Institution:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Academic Program:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Check one box to note 2 year process (planning year and testing year)**

- Planning Year 2010-11 and Testing Year 2011-12
- Planning Year 2011-12 and Testing Year 2012-13
- Planning Year 2012-13 and Testing Year 2013-14
- Planning Year 2013-14 and Testing Year 2014-15
- Planning Year 2014-15 and Testing Year 2015-16

**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 instrument 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 instrument address?**

**What steps need to be taken to construct this assessment instrument?**

| Timeline | Action |
|----------|--------|
|          |        |
|          |        |
|          |        |

**Who will review this assessment instrument?**

| Name | Credentials |
|------|-------------|
|      |             |
|      |             |

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

| Timeline | Action |
|----------|--------|
|          |        |
|          |        |
|          |        |