

The State of Tennessee

PERFORMANCE FUNDING STANDARDS
FOR PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

July 1, 1987

Revised February 9, 1990

General Provisions

- (1) The Standards and provisions contained herein shall apply to all public universities, community colleges, and technical institutions in Tennessee and all units thereof that are subject to formula funding and shall become effective July 1, 1987.
- (2) Accordingly, each institution shall annually conduct the assessment activities required by these Standards and shall report the results thereof to its governing board and, through it, to the Tennessee Higher Education Commission as part of its official budget submission.
- (3) Institutions shall submit their annual Performance Funding report to the governing board staff prior to July 1 of each year for review and submission to the Commission staff by August 1 of the same year.
- (4) All data and other information required in the institution's annual report will be submitted in the formats provided by the Commission and governing board staff.
- (5) In each instance when these Standards require approval of the governing board staff, requests for such approval must be submitted with the written endorsement of the institution's chief academic officer.
- (6) In each instance when these Standards require approval of the Commission staff, request for such approval must be submitted with the written endorsement of the institution's chief academic officer and that of the designated member of the governing board's academic staff.
- (7) All institutional request for action by the governing board or Commission staff as may be required by the provisions of these Standards must be filed with the governing board staff before December 1 and with the Commission staff before January 1 of the academic year in which the proposed action is to be implemented. Petitions and request received after the specified will be considered only for implementation in the next academic year.
- (8) The Executive Director of the Tennessee Higher Education may, for good and reasonable cause and with the concurrence of both governing board staffs, authorize modifications of these Standards. In such cases, the modifications shall be applied uniformly to all institutions. In particular, the Commission staff shall seek norms for student performance from peer institutions designated for the funding formula, and these norms will be adopted through the preceding process of modification.

Standard I

PROGRAM ACCREDITATION
(Maximum Score: 20 points)

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward institutions for achieving and maintaining program accreditation.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Evaluation will be based on the percentage of eligible programs that are accredited. Percentages will be rounded to the nearest whole number and points will be determined as per Scoring Table 1 below:

Scoring Table 1

	0	65	74	82	86	90	94	97	
% Programs Accredited	to 65	to 73	to 81	to 85	to 89	to 93	to 96	to 99	100
Score	0	10	13	15	16	17	18	19	20

Definitions and Procedures

1. A program is defined as a duly approved degree major which appears on the institution's official program inventory as maintained and published by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Options, concentrations, or other sub-majors are not covered under this variable even if separately accredited.
2. A program is defined as eligible if there is a recognized agency which accredits programs for that field and degree level. All COPA agencies are automatically recognized. Non-COPA agencies may be recognized for specific fields by the unanimous decision of institutions offering degree majors in those fields. Once so recognized, all programs accreditable by such agencies become eligible five years after the agency has been formally recognized. Recognized agencies are shown in Appendix A.
3. Programs automatically excluded from eligibility are programs that:
 - a. have been approved by the Commission for less than five years, unless the program is accredited by a recognized agency;
 - b. have been terminated or are being phased out by appropriate governing board action;

- c. have been on "inactive" status by the appropriate governing board and the Commission;
 - d. are accreditable by any agency that received recognition less than five years from the start of the current Performance Funding Cycle; or
 - e. that have been officially excluded by action of the Commission staff in accordance with the procedures outlined in Item #6 below.
4. Program fields covered by an umbrella accreditation are counted individually. For example, if an institution offers five bachelor's degree majors in business, and the business school or college is AACSB accredited at the undergraduate level, these five majors will be counted as five programs for the purposes of this standard.
 5. A program eligible for accreditation by more than one agency will be counted only once on the eligible list.
 6. An institution with six or more accreditable programs may request exclusion of up to 2% or one program, whichever is more. Program exclusions may be approved by the Commission staff for reasons limited to obstacles to accreditation owing to program organization, curriculum, or objectives.
 7. Any program that is excluded as a result of the process described in Item #6 above must be reviewed by at least two external consultants approved by the governing board and Commission staffs at least once during the five-year cycle to which these guidelines apply. A report of this review, which includes at least a statement of the program's strengths and weaknesses, recommendations for improvement, and institutional plans to address those recommendations should be submitted in the next Performance Funding report following the review.
 8. For the purpose of this standard, official notice of accreditation must be received by the THEC staff by January 1 of each year in order to be counted in the calculation of number and percentage of accreditable programs for that year. Programs that receive notice of accreditation after January 1 will be accredited to the institution in the following year.
 9. Proposals for changes in eligibility of programs, in program exclusions, or in the recognition of accrediting agencies as outlined in Items #2 and #6 above must be submitted to the Commission staff by January 1 of each year. The official list of eligible programs and of recognized accrediting agencies shall be maintained and distributed to the institutions by the Commission staff.

Standard II

MAJOR FIELD ASSESSMENT (Maximum Score: 30 Points)

This standard applies differently to universities and to two-year institutions, Its applications are, therefor, described separately below.

II. A. Universities

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward a university for the quality of its major field programs as evaluated by (1) the performance of graduating students on approved undergraduate major field tests; and, (2) by external review of master's programs.

1. Student Performance on Major Field Tests

For the purpose of this standard, an institution's undergraduate major field programs are divided into three groups: (a) licensure and certification programs; (b) other major field programs; and, (c) special major field programs.

a. Licensure and Certification Programs (Maximum Points = 10)

Major field programs in each of the following four professional fields will be assessed twice during a five-year Performance Funding Cycle through the performance of graduating students on licensure or certification examinations.

- (1) nursing
- (2) teacher education
- (3) engineering
- (4) accounting

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Success in a field will be determined (1) by the level of student performance relative to the national mean and (2) on the extent of improvement over previous student performance of record. Scoring Table 2 below applies.

If there are two or more major programs within a field, the score for that field will be determined by averaging the scores of the separate major programs within the field.

In any year in which a single field is tested, the institution's score will be its score in that field. In those years in which two or more fields are tested, the institution's score will be the average of its scores for the fields tested.

In years when there are no fields tested, the institution's score will be average of scores for the preceding years of the cycle.

Scoring Table 2

% of Students Scoring Above National Mean	Incr* less than 2	Incr* 2.0 to 2.9	Incr* 3.0 to 3.9	Incr* 4.0 to 4.9	Incr* 5.0 or more
51 or more	10	10	10	10	10
47 to 50	6	8	10	10	10
40 to 46	4	6	8	10	10
30 to 39	2	4	6	8	10
less than 30	0	2	4	6	8

*increase in % of student scoring above the national mean

b. Other Undergraduate Major Field Programs (Maximum Points = 10)

All undergraduate major field programs, other than those assessed as per the provisions of Standard A.1.a. above and those formally exempted in accordance with the provisions of Item A.1.b(2) below, will be assessed at least once during a five-year period through the performance of graduating students on approved tests.

c. Special Programs

Major field programs in mathematics, economics, and foreign languages when otherwise exempted from the provisions of Standard A.2 above must nonetheless be assessed at least once during each five-year period through the performance of graduating or enrolled students on approved tests. Special provisions for these three important liberal education fields are given below in Item A.1.c(1) and (2).

Selection of Test Instruments

Testing for major field programs may be conducted using any of three approved types of instruments: (a) externally normed tests, (b) cooperative tests, or (c) locally developed tests. The selection of the type of test in a field that is offered by at least five institutions will be determined for all institutions offering the field by the rule of the majority except that a dissenting institution may, upon demonstration of substantive programmatic differences, be exempted by the Commission staff from the rule of the majority. Finally, in the event that a majority is not reached, each institution may choose independently.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

A major field program will be considered successful if the mean score of all examinees (1) exceeds a recognized norm or (2) has improved over the last previous performance of records. An institution's score for this Standard will be determined by its cumulative success rate, i.e., the fields tested to date, including retests, during the same cycle. Points will be awarded as per Scoring Table 3 below.

Scoring Table 3

% Successful programs	0 to 35.9	36 to 45.9	46 to 54.9	55 to 62.9	63 to 69.9	70 to 74.9	75 to 79.9	80 to 100
Score	0	2	4	6	7	8	9	10

2. External Review of Master's Programs (Maximum Score = 10 Points)

Each eligible master's degree program will be assessed once during a five-year cycle by means of an external review.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring:

An institution will assess, according to an approved schedule, at least 20% of its eligible programs in the first year and a cumulative increment of an additional 20% in each subsequent year of the five-year cycle.

Programs will be evaluated for meeting the standards set fourth by the Tennessee Council of Graduate Schools (TCGS) in its publication Components of Quality in Master's Programs. The evaluation will consist of two parts, each separately scored as described below.

In any year in which a single field is evaluated, the institution's score will be its score in that field. In those years in which two or more fields are evaluated, the institution's score will be average of its scores for the fields evaluated. In years when there are no fields evaluated, the institution's score will be the average of scores for the preceding years of the cycle.

a. Objective TCGS Standards (7 points)

An external review will be conducted to ascertain whether or not the program meets the objective standards of the TCGS in each of the following ten categories:

1. Screening and supervision of students
2. Core curriculum
3. Availability and sophistication of coursework

4. Methodology and techniques of discipline
5. Extra-disciplinary experience
6. Comprehensive examination
7. Culminating experience
8. Research
9. Communication
10. Application of knowledge

Means of Scoring

Each major field program will be given a score from 0 to 7 depending on the number of TCGS standards met as per Scoring Table 4 below. To calculate the institutional score for the purpose of this Standards, the scores of all major fields assessed in a given year will be averaged and rounded to the nearest whole number and Scoring Table 4 below will apply.

Scoring Table 4

Number of Standards Met	1-2	3-5	6-7	8	9	10
Points	0	3	4	5	6	7

b. Qualitative TCGS Standards (3 Points)

Through the external review, the institution will measure a program's level of achievement in each of the following four categories:

1. Overall Quality of the Students' Learning Experience
2. Faculty Quality
3. Quality of Teaching and Learning Environment
4. The Quality and Use of Program Evaluation

Means of Scoring

Each of the above four categories will be evaluated and given a score 1, 2, or 3 points based on the level of perceived performance. The average of these points to one decimal will constitute the program's score. Individual program scores will be again averaged to establish the institution's total score for this standard and Scoring Table 5 below will apply.

Scoring Table 5

Average Score	0.1 to 0.9	1.0 to 1.7	1.8 to 2.3	2.4 to 3.0
Points	0	1	2	3

Definitions and Procedures

General

- a. Whenever a major field program is assessed for purpose of this standard, all graduating students in that program must be tested. Individual students may, for good and reasonable cause, be exempted by the chief academic officer.
- b. A "major field" is defined as all programming at one degree level bearing the same name (for example, a B.A. and B.S. in Psychology would be considered one major field). The THEC Academic Inventory constitutes the official list and count of an institution's major field programs.
- c. Two or more closely related major field programs with different names may be considered as one field at the request of the institution and the approval of the Commission staff. (This might apply, for example, to Mathematics and Applied Mathematics.)
- d. If a university offers a major field program at both the associate and baccalaureate level, the baccalaureate level program will be assessed for the purpose of this standard.
- e. If a major field consist of a program in which one or more of the concentrations is licensed or certified and in which there are other concentrations that are not licensed or certified, then the licensed or certified concentration will be tested under the provision of A.1.a below. The non-licensed or certified fields will be fully exempt from testing under this Standard.
- f. All request for prior approval as may be required for the implementation of this standard and each of its parts (e.g., changes in testing schedules, plans to construct local tests or cooperative tests and the like) must be submitted to the Commission staff prior to January 1 of the year in which implementation will occur.

A.1.a. Licensure and Certification Programs

- (1) An interval of at least one year must separate the two required assessments of each major field program within the four specified fields.
- (2) Engineering shall be understood to mean civil, electrical , mechanical, and general engineering where the previous three major field programs are not offered.
- (3) In reporting performance for this standard, an institution will report both the performance of the field programs within the field (e.g., Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education, etc., within Teacher Education). The institution's score, however, will be based on the performance of the field as a whole.

- (4) If the data showing % of students scoring above the mean are unavailable, other data such as % of students passing may, with the permission of the Commission staff, be submitted.
- (5) Nursing programs which require that a student has passed the licensure examination as a condition of admission to the program will not be assessed under these provisions. Such nursing programs will be assessed under the provisions of Standard A.1.b.
- (6) Institutions offering Nursing at both the associate and the baccalaureate level will test only the graduating seniors of the baccalaureate program. Institutions offering Nursing only at the associate level will test the graduating students of that program.
- (7) Institutions offering Teacher Education as a five-year program will assess Teacher Education by testing students graduating at that level. In all case, institutions will report the combined score of Parts I, II, and III on the core battery of the NTE.

A.1.b. Other Undergraduate Major Field Programs

- (1) Prior to the start of a five-year Performance Funding cycle, each institution will develop and submit to the Commission staff a schedule for assessment of fields that fall under the provisions of this standard. This schedule must satisfy the following condition:

At least 20% of the major fields cover by this section of the standard must be assessed in Year 1; at least 40% by the end of Year 2; at least 60% by the end of Year 3; at least 80% by the end of Year 4; and 100% by the end of Year 5.

- (2) If all of the following four conditions are satisfied simultaneously, the major field is covered under this standard; if one or more of the conditions is not met, the program in question is exempt:
 - (a) The major field is mature, where maturity means at least five years of operation.
 - (b) The field is active at the beginning of the cycle.
 - (c) The field has graduated an average of at least ten students per year during the previous Performance Funding Cycle.
 - (d) The field has graduated enough students to rank among the upper 75% of the institution's programs exclusive of licensure and certification programs in number of graduates produced during the previous Performance Funding cycle.

(3) A major field program not already exempt under A.1.b(2) above may be exempted from the provisions of Standards II upon demonstration that the program falls by definition into one or more of the following categories:

- (a) Performance-oriented programs in the fine and performing arts.
 - (b) Individualized programs in which a student "designs" a course of study by selecting courses from the curricula of several major field programs (e.g., Humanities).
 - (c) Interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary programs whose standard curriculum is composed principally of courses from two or more disciplines (e.g., Latin America Studies, Environmental Studies).
 - (d) 3 + 1, 3 + 2 programs and similar programs which frequently lead to a bachelor's, master's, or professional degree, usually awarded by an institution to which the undergraduate student has transferred after the completion of the first three years of baccalaureate-level study (e.g., pre-pharmacy).
- (4) The Commission staff will generate a list of all major field programs offered by five or more institutions. Each such institution will state its performance for type of test to be used in the assessment, i.e., (a) an externally validated test, (b) a cooperative test, or (c) a locally developed test.
- (5) The Commission staff will maintain and circulate a list of approved externally validated tests. An externally validated test may be used with additional questions and still be counted as an externally validated test, but only if it is scored without reference to the additional questions.
- (6) Cooperative tests are instruments drawn according to approved specifications from a common test-item bank established by two or more institutions offering the same major field program. If two or more institutions choose to develop such a test-item bank, a plan for doing so must be submitted for Commission staff approval. Minimally the plan must contain provisions for assuring: (a) A comprehensive evaluation of student learning in the major field; (b) a sufficient number of questions to permit random selection; (c) item validity; and (d) overall test validity.
- (7) A cooperative test must include: (a) a constant number of test items randomly drawn from a core pool of test items and (b) an additional number of questions selected at random from specialized test-item pools that reflect the major curricular areas of the program field.

The total number of items in the test and the number of items in the core must be the same for all institutions using the Cooperative test. On the other hand, the distribution of the additional items may vary to reflect programmatic emphasis and local preference. (For example, if a Cooperative Test is to be used in mathematics, the using institutions may be determine to draw a test of 50 items. Of these, they determine that 25 must be chosen from the core pool. The remaining 25 items will be randomly selected from the curricular areas of algebra, analysis, topology/set theory, and probability/statistics. The distribution of these letter 25 items across those curricular areas, however, may vary from institution to institution to reflect a program's particular emphasis.)

- (8) A locally developed test that is to be used without change from its approved form in the previous cycle is automatically approved for use in the current cycle. One that is changed, but by less than 20% of the questions, must be approved by the chief academic officer of the institution with notice in the annual Performance Funding report. The revised test should be kept on file for possible inspection but need not be submitted. A locally developed test that is changed by 20% or more will be treated as a new locally developed test and is subject to the provisions of Items (9) and (10) below.
- (9) If an existing locally developed test is to be changed by more than 20% or entirely replaced by a new locally developed test, an explanation of why the previous instrument is being discarded must be submitted for prior approval by the Commission staff.
- (10) A plan for construction of a new local test must be submitted for Commission staff approval. The plan must include a schedule of activities, the credentials of at least two external content reviewers and at least one test construction authority (who may be internal to the institution). The instrument, once completed, must have written approval from the external reviewers, and from the chief academic officer of the institution. A document or documents attesting to these approvals should be submitted as a part of the annual Performance Funding report. The instrument itself should not be submitted to the Commission staff but should be kept on file for possible inspection.
- (11) In reporting test results for which more than one descriptive datum of average performance is available, a mean score is preferred to a percentile datum, and a percentile datum is preferred to a pass/fail rate. If more than one norm group is available for comparison, national norms are preferred to regional norms which are preferred to state norms.
- (12) To demonstrate success in a field by performance above a recognized norm, an externally validated test or a cooperative test must be used for assessment. In such cases, success can be demonstrated by either of the following methods:

- (a) an institutional mean score above the recognized mean; or
 - (b) a majority of students' scores above the recognized mean.
- (13) To demonstrate success in a field by improved performance an institution may use either of the following methods:
- (a) an institutional mean score above the most recent previous mean score of record (for a revised locally developed test, only the score on common questions should be compared); or
 - (b) an increased percentage of students performing above the recognized mean compared to the percentage exceeding the recognized mean in the last previous administration of the test (not an available method for locally developed tests).
- (14) An institution may show improvement only over scores of record.
- (15) An institution planning to retest a particular field must notify the Commission staff prior to January 1 of the year in which the retest will take place.
- (16) Modifications of the approved testing schedule must be reported to the Commission staff by January 1 of the year in which the change will be implemented.

A.1.c. Special Program

- (1) Whenever a major field program in mathematics, economics, or foreign language is, as a result of provision 1.b(2) above, exempt from assessment under Standard 1.b, it shall be assessed by one of the following methods:
- (a) testing all graduating seniors in consecutive years until at least 10 students are tested; or
 - (b) testing students who are completing an introductory course for the field in questions. In this case, the institution may select an introductory course subject to Commission staff approval and may select a random sample of non-honors sections for the course that account for at least half of the enrollment in that course. All students in these selected sections are expected to take the test.
- (2) An institution will be exempted from provision A.1.c(1) above for foreign language if at least one foreign language major is assessed under the provisions of Standard A.1.b above. If it has no such major, then the provisions of Standard A.1.c above shall apply. (For example, if an institution offers major field programs in Latin, French, and Spanish, and there are ten graduating seniors in the Latin program, then the institution shall assess the graduates of the Latin major under the provisions of Standard A.1.b and shall be totally exempt from assessing the other foreign language majors and from the provisions of Standard A.1.c.)

A.2. External Review of Master's Programs

- a. In order for a field to meet each of the Formal Standards, the following corresponding conditions must be met. Where two or more conditions correspond to a given standard, all such conditions must be fulfilled to meet the standards.
- (1a) Clearly stated admission and retention standards to ensure that a quality learning environment exists are circulated to applicants for admission and to enrolled students, respectively. Inclusion in the institution's catalog would be sufficient to fulfill this condition.
 - (1b) Personalized instruction, advisement, and guidance are provided to students.
 - (1c) Students' progress is periodically monitored.
 - (1d) Time limits are checked to ensure student is up to date when degree is awarded.
 - (2a) There is a core of required coursework appropriate to the discipline.
 - (3a) Courses are offered frequently enough to allow students to progress at a reasonable pace.
 - (3b) There is provision for planned disciplinary specialization beyond the core.
 - (3c) Courses are characterized by advanced disciplinary content.
 - (3d) Degree credit is given for dual-listed courses in no more than 30% of total hours required.
 - (4a) The program includes tools, techniques, and methodology that are needed to understand the discipline, undertake research in the discipline, and actually practice the education acquired.
 - (5a) Some academic exposure outside the immediate degree major or discipline should be available to students without increasing the total number of hours required for the degree. Students should be apprised of the availability of such exposure. Amount elements that would constitute such exposure are related courses outside the major and internships or practice. In professional fields, students should allowed courses outside their professional school.
 - (6a) At or near the end of all coursework, students should be required to take a written or oral comprehensive examination demonstrating the breadth of knowledge in the discipline, depth in specific areas, and the ability to integrate what has been learned.

- (6b) A student's comprehensive examination must be kept on file for a minimum of five years.
- (7a) Each student should have a culminating experience that demonstrates communication skills and the ability to apply knowledge independently. Written culminating experiences must be kept on file for a minimum of five years. The categories of culminating experience are:
 - i. thesis or comparable expository paper(s)
 - ii. narrative analysis of case studies or problem sets
 - iii. recital or exhibit
 - iv. written report on a practicum or internship
- (8a) The student must demonstrate mastery of research in the discipline through traditional research papers, literature reviews, reports, or case studies.
- (9a) The student must demonstrate the ability to communicate in a manner and at a level appropriate to the degree and the discipline, both orally and in writing. Explicit program components should be designed to provide opportunity for this demonstration.
- (10a) The student is required to develop and demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge learned in coursework through specific experiences (e.i., research assistantship, performance of musical work, field problems) designed for this purpose.
- b. When evaluating the Qualitative Standards, the program's level of achievement on each of the following criteria must be weighed. The numerical scale of 3, 2, 1, or 0 correspond respectively to excellent, good, minimally acceptable, and poor.
 - (1a) There is a critical mass of students taking sufficient coursework to ensure a coherent group of peers.
 - (1b) Prudence is exercised in the number and type of short courses (and other courses taught in non-traditional format) accepted toward the degree.
 - (1c) There are adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.
 - (2a) Faculty backgrounds adequately span the major concentrations in the field.
 - (2b) Faculty have sufficient scholarly activity to serve as effective mentors for students.
 - (2c) Where appropriate, faculty have sufficient practical professional experience to serve as effective mentors for students.

- (3a) There is adequate library support.
 - (3b) There is adequate and accessible computer support.
 - (3c) There is adequate lab facilities.
 - (3d) There is adequate office space.
 - (3e) There are regular opportunities for professional development including travel and participation in workshops and other learning activities.
 - (3f) Teaching loads are consonant with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses.
 - (3g) There are ample materials and secretarial support to encourage search and publication.
 - (4a) Follow-up data on students are systematically collected, and there is internal research for planning and quality control.
 - (4b) The curriculum is periodically evaluated.
- c. The external review must be conducted by at least one qualified consultant selected with prior approval of the governing board in consultation with the Commission staff.

II. B. Two-year Institutions

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward an institution for the quality of its major field programs as evaluated (1) by the performance of students graduating from its associate degree and certificate programs on approved major field tests from (2) by the placement rate of its program graduates.

1. Student Performance on Major Field Tests

For the purpose of this Standard, an institution's major field programs are divided into two groups: (a) licensure and certification programs and (b) other major field programs.

a. Licensure and Certification Programs (Maximum Points = 10)

Major field programs in each of the following three professional fields will be assessed twice during a five-year Performance Funding Cycle through the performance of graduating students on licensure or certification examinations:

- (1) nursing
- (2) allied health
- (3) engineering technology

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Success in a field will be determined (1) by the level of student performance relative to the national mean and (2) on the extent of improvement over previous student performance of record. Scoring Table 6 below applies.

If there are two or more major programs within a field, the score for that field will be determined by averaging the scores of the separate major programs within the field.

In any year in which a single field is tested, the institution's score will be its score in that field. In those years in which two or more fields are tested, the institution's score will be the average of its scores for those fields. In years when there are no fields tested, the institution's score will be the average of scores for the preceding years of the cycle.

Scoring Table 6

% of Students Scoring Above National Mean	Incr* less than 2	Incr* 2.0 to 2.9	Incr* 3.0 to 3.9	Incr* 4.0 to 4.9	Incr* 5.0 or more
51 or more	10	10	10	10	10
47 to 50	6	8	10	10	10
40 to 46	4	6	8	10	10
30 to 39	2	4	6	8	10
less than 30	0	2	4	6	8

*increase in % of students scoring above the national mean

b. Other Major Field Programs (Maximum Points = 10)

All major field programs, other than those assessed as per the provisions of A.1.a above and those formally exempted in accordance with the provisions of A.1.b(2) below, will be assessed at least once during a five-year period through the performance of graduating students on approved tests.

Selection of Test Instruments

Testing of major field programs may be conducted using any of three (3) approved types of instruments: (a) externally normed tests, (b) cooperative tests, or (c) locally developed tests. The selection of the type of test in a field that is offered by at least five institutions offering the field by the rule of the majority except that a dissenting institution may, upon demonstration of substantive programmatic differences, be exempted by the Commission staff from the rule of the majority. Finally, in the event that a majority is not reached, each institution may choose independently.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

A major field program will be considered successful if the mean score of all examinees (1) exceeds a recognized norm or (2) has improved over the last previous performance of record. An institution's score for this Standard will be determined by its cumulative success rate, i.e., the total number of successes during a cycle divided by the number of major fields tested to date, including retests, during the same cycle. Points will be awarded as per Scoring Table 7 below.

Scoring Table 7

% Successful Programs	0 to 35.9	36 to 45.9	46 to 54.9	55 to 62.9	63 to 69.9	70 to 74.9	75 to 79.9	80 to 100
Score	0	2	4	6	7	8	9	10

2. Placement Rate of Program Graduates (Maximum Score = 10 Points)

Each major field program will be evaluated by the placement rate of its graduates. A program will be considered successful if the placement rate is at least 75%. The institution's score will be determined by the percentage of successful programs according to Scoring Table 8 below.

Scoring Table 8

% Successful Programs	60-69.9	70-79.9	80-89.9	90-100
Score	5	7	9	10

Definitions and Procedures

A.0. General Provisions

- a. Whenever a major field program is assessed for purposes of this standard, all graduating students in that program must be tested. Individual student may, for good and reasonable cause, be exempted by the chief academic officer.
- b. A "major field" is defined as an academic degree or certification program. The THEC Academic Inventory constitutes the official list and count of an institution's major field programs.
- c. Two or more closely related programs with different names may be considered as one field at the request of the institution and the approval of the Commission staff. (This might apply, for example, to Civil Engineering Technology and Surveying.)
- d. If an institution offers a major field program at both the associate and the certificate level, the associate level program will be assessed for the purposes of this standard.
- e. All request for prior approval as may be required for the implementation of this standard and each of its parts (e.g., changes in accreditation status, in testing schedules, plans to construct local tests or test-item banks, and the like) must be submitted to the Commission staff prior to January 1 of the year in which the implementation will occur.

A.1.a. Licensure and Certification Programs

- (1) An interval of at least one year must be separate the two required assessments of each major field program within the three specified fields.
- (2) If the data showing % of students scoring above the mean are unavailable, other data such as % of students passing may, with the approval of the Commission staff, be substituted.
- (3) In reporting performance for this part of the standard, an institution will report both the performance of the field as a whole and the performance of the individual major field programs within the field (e.g., Allied Health and Respiratory Therapy, Dental Hygiene, and Physical Therapy Assistant). The institution's score, however, will be based on the performance of the field as a whole.

A.1.b. Other Major Field Programs

- (1) Prior to the start of a five-year Performance Funding cycle, each institution will develop and submit to the Commission staff a schedule for assessment of fields that fall under the provisions of this section of the standard. This schedule must satisfy the following condition:

At least 20% of the major fields cover by this section of the standard must be assessed in Year 1; at least 40% by the end of Year 2; at least 60% by the end of Year 3; at least 80% by the end of Year 4; and 100% by the end of Year 5.

- (2) If all of the following four conditions are satisfied simultaneously, the field is covered under this part of the guidelines; if one or more of the conditions is not met, the major field program in question is exempt:
 - (a) The major field must be mature or reach maturity during the five-year cycle, where maturity means at least five years of operation.
 - (b) The field must be active and not in phase out at the beginning of the cycle.
 - (c) The field must have graduated an average of at least ten students per year during the previous Performance Funding cycle.
 - (d) The field must have graduate enough students to rank among the upper 75% of the institution's programs exclusive of licensure and certification programs in number of graduates during the previous Performance Funding cycle.

(3) A major field program not already exempt under A.1.b(2) above may be exempt from the provisions of Standard II upon demonstration that the program falls by definition into one or more of the following categories:

- (a) Programs leading to an A.A. or A.S. degree designed to transfer to a university.
 - (b) General technology programs whose standard curriculum is composed principally of courses from two or more programs offered at the institution.
 - (c) 2 + 2 programs and similar programs which frequently lead to an associate degree, usually awarded by the institution after completion of a professional program at a college or university to which the student has transferred prior to graduation (e.g., Physical Therapy Assistant and some other allied health programs).
- (4) The Commission staff will generate a list of all major field programs offered by five or more institutions. Each such institution will state its preference for type of test to be used in the assessment, i.e., (a) an externally validated test, (b) a cooperative test, or (c) a locally developed test.
- (5) The Commission staff will maintain and circulate a list of approved externally validated tests. An externally validated test may be used with additional questions and still be counted as an externally validated test, but only if it is scored without reference to the additional questions.
- (6) Cooperative tests are instruments drawn according to approved specifications from a common test-item bank established by two or more institutions offering the same major field program. If two or more institutions choose to develop such a test-item bank, a plan for doing so must be submitted for Commission staff approval. Minimally the plan must contain provisions for assuring: (a) comprehensive evaluation of student learning in the major field; (b) a sufficient number of questions to permit random selection; (c) item validity; and (d) overall test validity.
- (7) A cooperative test must include (a) a constant number of test items randomly drawn from a core pool of test items and (b) an additional number of questions selected at random from specialized test-item pools that reflect the major curricular areas of the program field. The total number of items in the test and the number of items in the core must be the same for all institutions using the cooperative test. On the other hand, the distribution of the additional questions in part (b) may vary to reflect programmatic emphasis and local preference. (For example, if a Cooperative Test is to be used in Business Technology, the using institutions may determine to draw a test of 50 items. Of these, they determine that 25 must be chosen from the core pool.

The remaining 25 items will be randomly selected from the curricular areas of accounting, business law, management, and data processing. The distribution of these 25 items across those curriculum areas, however, may vary from institution to institution to reflect a program's particular emphasis.)

- (8) A locally developed test is to be used without change from its approved form in the previous cycle is automatically approved for use in the current cycle. One that is changed, but by less than 20% of the questions, must be approved by the chief academic officer of the institution with notice in the annual Performance Funding report. The revised test should be kept on file for possible inspection but should not be submitted. A locally developed test that is changed by 20% or more will be treated as a new locally developed test and is subject to the provisions of Items (9) and (10) below.
- (9) If an existing locally developed test is to be changed by more than 20% or entirely replaced by a new locally developed test, an explanation of why the previous instrument is being discarded must be submitted for prior approval by the Commission staff.
- (10) A plan for construction of a new local test must be submitted for Commission staff approval. The plan must include a schedule of activities, the credentials of at least two external content reviewers, and at least one test construction authority (who may be internal to the institution). The instrument, once completed, must have written approval from the external reviewers, and from the chief academic officer of the institution. A document or documents attesting to these approvals should be submitted as part of the annual Performance Funding report. The instrument itself should not be submitted to the Commission staff but should be kept on file for possible inspection.
- (11) In reporting test results for which more than one datum descriptive of average performance of both the graduates and the norm group is available, a mean score is preferred to a percentile datum, and a percentile datum is preferred to a pass/fail rate. If more than one norm group is available for comparison, national norms are preferred to regional norms which are preferred to state norms.
- (12) To demonstrate success in a field by performance above a recognized norm, an externally validated test or a cooperative test must be used for assessment. In such cases, success can be demonstrated by either of the following methods:
 - (a) An institutional mean score above the recognized mean; or
 - (b) a majority of students' scores above the recognized mean.
- (13) To demonstrate success in a field by improved performance an institution may use either of the following methods:

- (a) an institutional mean score above the most recent previous mean score of record (for a revised locally developed test, only the score on common questions should be compared);
 - (b) an increased percentage of students above the recognized mean compared to the percentage exceeding the recognized mean in the last previous administration of the test (not an available method for locally developed tests).
- (14) An institution may show improvement only over scores reported in Performance Funding reports.
- (15) An institution planning to retest a particular field must notify the governing board and Commission staff prior to January 1 of the year in which the retest will take place.
- (16) Changes in the approved testing schedule must be reported to the Commission staff by January 1 of the year in which the change will occur.

A.2. Placement Rate of Program Graduates

- a. For the purpose of this standard, "program graduates" is taken to mean all program completers who have filed an application to graduate.
- b. An institution will conduct at least one follow-up survey of graduates to determine the number placed. Graduates of the Winter, Spring, Summer, and Fall terms within a calendar year will be surveyed through June 30 of the following year. Auditable records of survey results must be maintained for at least two years.
- c. An institution will include in its report on this standard the placement rate of graduates surveyed during the preceding Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring terms. (Thus, for example, in the 1988 Performance Funding report, an institution will include the placement results of all graduates surveyed between July 1, 1987 and June 30, 1988 according to the schedule in the preceding paragraph.)
- d. The placement percentage is calculated as the ratio of the total number of students placed in fields for which they were trained to the total number of program completers less those in military services or pursuing further education.
- e. A list of occupations appropriate to each program subject to evaluation under this standard shall be maintained by the Commission staff.

Standard III

UNDERGRADUATE GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES (Maximum Score: 20 Points)

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward an institution for the quality of its undergraduate general education program as measured by the performance of its graduating students on an approved standardized and externally normed test of general education.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Institutional performance in this standard is measured in two ways equally: (1) by the mean value-added score of its student compared to the external value-added norm and (2) by the performance in mean score of its students universities (U) and two-year colleges (C) as indicated.

Scoring Table 9

Mean ACT/E	Mean Value-Added Gain														
	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
23 or More	U:	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10						
	C:	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10						
22	U:	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10					
	C:	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10						
21	U:	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10				
	C:	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10					
20	U:	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10			
	C:	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10				
18-19	U:	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10		
	C:	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10			
16-17	U:	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	
	C:	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10		
0-15	U:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10
	C:	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	

Scoring Table 10

ACT COMP Percentile	Institutional Score
65 or More	10
60 - 64	09
55 - 59	08
50 - 54	06
45 - 49	05
40 - 44	03
30 - 39	02
20 - 29	01

Definitions and Procedures

1. The approved testing instrument to be used for the purposes of this standard shall be the ACT COMP, and the normative data shall be those published by ACT separately for universities and for two-year institutions.
2. This standard applies only to the undergraduate program and includes all baccalaureate- and associate-level students, including students in career programs at two-year institutions.
3. An institution, except as provided below, shall test its entire graduating cohort of a single academic year. Individual students, however, may, for good and reasonable cause, be exempted by the institution's chief academic officer.
4. If the total number of graduates to be tested in any year exceeds 1500, the institution may, for the purposes of this standard, elect to test a representative sample of its graduates. In this case, the sample cohort must be drawn from the total graduating cohort of a single academic year, be statistically representative of the total cohort, and be equivalent in number to at least 60% of the total.
5. Value-added for an individual student will be calculated by the American College Testing Corporation according to whichever of the following procedures apply:
 - a. The difference of the student's existing ACT COMP score and the student's freshmen ACT COMP score, if the student has a freshmen score; or
 - b. The difference of the student's exiting ACT COMP score and the student's ACT COMP score imputed from his entering ACT score using the standard ACT concordance.
6. In calculating the institutional mean ACT COMP score in Table 10, the score of all students tested will be used. This includes transfer students as well as those lacking the ACT/E score.

7. Special provision is made for technical institutes. For the academic year beginning in Fall 1987 these institutions will receive full points for this standard for reviewing and revising their curricula in order to meet general education expectations. For the academic year beginning in Fall 1988, these institutions will receive full points for administering the ACT COMP to to their graduating students and reporting the test results. In the academic year beginning in Fall 1989, technical institutes will fall under the general provisions of this Standard.

Standard IV

ALUMNI SATISFACTION SURVEYS (Maximum Score: 15 Points)

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward institutions for the quality of their educational programs as measured by the level of satisfaction expressed by alumni on a standard survey as compared to national or other norms.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Institutions will, in the first, third, and fifth year of a cycle, survey all undergraduate alumni who graduate two years before the year in which the survey is conducted.

Institutions will be evaluated on the basis of their individual performance against the established norms. An institution will be considered successful on individual questions if: (a) the expressed level of satisfaction exceeds the established norm or (b) if it shows improvement over the last previous performance of records. The aggregate rate of success on individual questions will constitute the institutional score and points will be awarded as per Scoring Table 11 below.

Scoring Table 11

% Items Successful	40 to 54	55 to 69	70 to 79	80 or More
Score	6	10	13	15

Definitions and Procedures

1. An "evaluative survey" is defined as one yielding quantifiable indices of satisfaction with or evaluation of instructional programs.
2. The survey instrument to be used for Standard IV is the one approved by governing boards and Commission staffs for use statewide for the duration of a five-year cycle.
3. Only items relating directly to the quality of classroom instruction or of academic support services such as library and academic counseling will be recognized for the purposes of this standard. While the institution may wish to add or to consider existing items related to non-academic services such as food service, lodging, parking, or other student conveniences, such items are excluded from the calculations for scoring purposes.
4. An institution must survey all alumni who graduated during the academic year to be surveyed.

5. In order to receive full credit under this standard, a minimum response rate of 30% must be attained. One point will be deducted for a response rate of 20% to 29%; two points will be deducted for a response rate of 10% to 19%; and three points will be deducted for a response rate of 9% or less.
- 6 In order to qualify for an award under this standard, an institution must submit (a) notice of the date(s) of administration; (b) the response rate; and (c) an analysis of the responses.
7. In years in which an institution is not requires by these guidelines to conduct the alumni survey, its score for this Standard in that year shall be the same as the one awarded in the last previous administration of the survey.
8. Although not included in the evaluation and scoring of this standard at this time, institutions must conduct a survey of drop-outs and non-completers to be reported in Year 1 or in Year 2 of the cycle.

Standard V

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES (Maximum Score: 15 Points)

Purpose

This standard is designed to reward institutions for two levels of programmatic improvements:

1. Immediate improvement measures for Standards I, II, III, IV.
2. Strategic instructional initiatives over a medium-range to long-range period of time, which are designed to address predetermined deficiencies that may or may not have been identified in Standards I, II, III, or IV.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

Five points will be assigned to each of the two elements according to the following provisions:

1. An institution may be awarded up to five points on the basis of responsive measures taken in undergraduate areas designated for improvement action, as described in the Definitions and Procedures below. The Commission staff, in consultation with the staffs of the governing boards, will verify the areas for improvement and determine whether the reported measures are responsive.
2. An institution may be awarded up to ten points on the basis of its development of benchmarks, strategies, and implementation, according to a predetermined calendar, toward achieving undergraduate instructional improvement and on its establishment of credible evaluation criteria. Such development must respond to weaknesses, including low graduation rates, identified by careful analysis and must reflect the current mission of the institution. Appropriate activities may include those undertaken by individual institutions, by groups of institutions, by governing board systems, or by statewide consortia. The Commission staff, in consultation with the staffs of the governing boards, will assign appropriate weights based on the thoroughness of analysis and projected remedies, the proper execution of activities, and the success of those activities. During the course of this Performance Funding cycle, the awarding of these ten points will reflect successful implementation of predetermined strategies and achievement of projected outcomes in line with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Institutional Effectiveness Criterion.

Definitions and Procedures

1. a. Areas for improvement action in all standards will be determined by performance during the prior year.

- b. In the case of licensed/certified fields (Standard II), areas for improvement action will be defined by performance below the established norm. For other undergraduate fields with normed tests, areas for improvement action will be defined by performance below the established norm that has not improved over the most recent prior performance. For undergraduate fields with locally developed tests, areas for improvement action will be defined by performance below 80% (mean percentage of correct items) or by lack of improvement over the most recent prior performance.
 - c. The COMP areas (Standard III) where measures can be taken are functioning within social institutions, using science and technology, using the arts, communicating, solving problems, and clarifying values.
 - d. Areas for improvement in the Alumni Survey (Standard IV) will be defined by performance on any question in the survey below the established norm.
 - e. To be considered responsive, measures must be concrete and must be judged sufficiently well-focused to have a good likelihood of improving student outcomes. Among the measures that may qualify as responsive are significant revisions of curriculum, appointment of additional staff, or extensions of field experience, but other measures may also qualify. In no case, however, will the setting up of faculty committees, the sending out of surveys, or the issuing of studies be considered, by themselves, responsive.
 - f. Institutional measures that have been evaluated as responsive in a given year will not be evaluated as responsive in a subsequent year.
 - g. This section must include a specific written endorsement of the reported measures by the chief academic officer of the institution.
2. Strategic initiatives and long-term institutional innovations must exhibit the following features:
- a. Specific and measurable goals and objects including a calendar or schedule for attainment.
 - b. A predetermined evaluation component designed to assess the effectiveness of the improvement measures applied.
 - c. Involvement of faculty in the development, execution, and evaluation components. (However, setting up committees, sending out surveys, and issuing reports will not, by themselves, be sufficient.)
 - d. Focus on student learning and instructional activities consistent with institutional mission per the current Commission master plan.

- e. Conformity of activities associated with changes to directions articulated in the current Commission master plan.
- f. Conformity of activities with the following language of the SACS Institutional Effectiveness Criterion:

"The institution must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation. The institution must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained...Because institutional research can provide significant information on all phases of a college or university program,...all institutions must engage in continuing study, analysis, and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs."
- g. A goal-setting procedure that provides broad representation of constituencies. (However, setting up committees, sending out surveys, and issuing reports will not, by themselves, be sufficient.)
- h. Impact of changes directed toward improvements in institutional environment and academic/student support sufficiently broad to denote shifts in institutional mission or in far-reaching institutional purposes.
- i. Specific written endorsement by the institutional president or chancellor and by the governing board staff.

Standard VI

DEVELOPING AND PILOTING OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS (Maximum Score: 10 points)

Purpose

This standard is designed to provide an incentive to an institution or group of institutions for developing and piloting tests and other assessment tools that have heretofore not been approved for use in the Performance Funding program. These instruments may be program specific for use in Standard II or may be of a general nature suitable for use under the provisions of Standard III.

Means of Evaluation and Scoring

An institution or group of institutions may be awarded up to five points for developing local and cooperative tests, or for administering and properly analyzing the results of standardized tests for possible use in Standard II; an additional five points may be awarded to the same or to other institutions for the development or piloting of such other standardized tests as may be used in conjunction with Standard III. In each case, the precise number of points that can be earned will be determined in advance by the Commission staff and will depend upon the nature and complexity of the instrument to be developed or piloted and the breadth of its potential use. In no case may an institution earn, singly or in the aggregate, more than ten points in this Standard during any one five-year cycle.

Definitions and Procedures

1. An institution must submit a proposal to the Commission staff prior to January 1 of the year preceding the one in which the assessment instrument(s) are to be developed or piloted. Plans will be reviewed by the Commission staff in consultation with both governing board staffs, and awards will be made on the basis of state-wide needs and comprehensiveness of the proposed activities.
2. If a test is to be developed to replace a local test in current use, the plan must include a rationale or justification for such replacement.
3. In developing or piloting testing instruments, the institution must follow statistically and psychometrically approved procedures.
4. If a test has been developed or piloted as a possible replacement of one in current use, an analysis must be presented that includes: (a) a correlation of the new test with the one in current use and (b) a discussion of the relative advantages and disadvantages of each.
5. The points earned under this standard cannot be used to push an institution's total score beyond 100 in any year; points earned under this standard, however, can be held over applied, in whole or in part, to a subsequent year's score.

ACCREDITING AGENCIES RECOGNIZED BY THE
 TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
 FOR PERFORMANCE FUNDING

Accrediting Agencies	Codes
Commission on Allied Health & Accreditation, American Medical Association	01
Liaison Committee on Medical Education, AMA-AAMC	02
National Architectural Accrediting Board	03
National Association of Schools of Art & Design	04
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business	05
American Chemical Society	06 *
Council on Chiropractic Education	07
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education	08 *
American Public Health Association	09 *
American Counsel for Construction Education	10
American Dental Association	11
American Dietetic Association	12
Accrediting Board for Engineering & Technology	13
Society of American Foresters	14
Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Admin. .	15
American Home Economics Association	16
National Association for Industrial Technology	17 *
Foundation for Interior Design Education & Research	18
Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism & Mass Commun . .	19
American Society of Landscape Architects	20
American Bar Association/Association of American Law Schools . .	21
American Library Association	22
National Association of Schools of Music	23
National League for Nursing	24
American Optometric Association	25
American Osteopathic Association	26
American Council on Pharmaceutical Education	27
American Podiatric Medical Association	28
American Psychological Association	29
Council on Education for Public Health	30
Council on Rehabilitation Education	31
Council on Social Work Education	32
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association	33
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	34
Association of Theological Schools in U.S. & Canada	35
American Veterinary Medical Association	36
Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools	37 *
American Physical Therapy Association	38
National Association for Practical Nursing Education	39 *
American Board for Certification in Orthotics/Prosthetics	40 *
American Association for Counseling & Development	41
American Board of Funeral Service Education	42
Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs.	43
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning	44
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs & Admin	45
National Recreation & Park Administration	46

* Not a current member of COPA

MASTER LIST OF TEST INSTRUMENTS FOR
MAJOR FIELD ASSESSMENT UNDER
PERFORMANCE FUNDING STANDARD II

Standard II A -- Licensure and Certification Programs

Accounting (Bachelors)

**American Institute for Certified
Public Accountants Achievement Test
Level II**

Accounting
Business Administration (Accounting)
General Business (Accounting)

Allied Health

Dental Assistant	TN Board of Dentistry Registry Examination
Dental Hygiene	National Board of Dental Hygiene Examination
Dietetic Technician	American Dietetic Association Certification Examination
Emergency Medical Tech.	TN Initial Paramedic Certif. Exam TN Initial Basic Exam
Medical Laboratory Tech.	TN Dept. of Public Health Licensing Exam for Technician General American Society of Clinical Pathologists Board of Registry Examination for Registry
Medical Records Tech.	American Medical Record Association Accreditation Exam for Medical Record Technicians
Occupational Therapy Asst.	Certif. Exam for Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant
Orthotic/Prosthetic Tech.	American Board for Certification in Orthotics & Prosthetics
Opticianry	TN State Board Exam Ophthalmic Dispensing
Phlebotomy	American Society of Clinical Path. Certification Exam National Certification Agency Certification Exam

Physical Therapy Asst.	American Physical Therapy Assoc. Licensing Examination
Radiologic Technology	American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Exam for Radiography
Respiratory Therapy Tech.	National Board of Respiratory Care Entry Level Exam
Animal Lab. Asst. Tech.	TN Dept. of Health & Environment Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners Animal Technician's State Board Exam
Animal Hospital Technology (AAS)	
Engineering	Engineer in Training Examination
Bachelors Degree Programs In:	
Civil Engineering	
Electrical Engineering	
Engineering	
Mechanical Engineering	
Engineering Technology	National Institute for Certification of Engineering Technicians Examination Part II
Associate Degree Programs In:	
Architectural Engineering Technology	
Civil Engineering Technology	
Civil/Construction Engineering Technology	
Electrical Engineering Technology	
Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology	
Electronic Engineering Technology	
Industrial Engineering Technology	
Mechanical Engineering Technology	
Telecommunications Engineering Technology	
Nursing	National Council Licensure Exam (NCLEX)
Associate Degree Nursing Programs	
Bachelors Degree Nursing Programs	
Teacher Education	National Teachers Examination
Agricultural Education	
Art Education	
Business Education	
Distributive Education	
Early Childhood Education	

Education
 Elementary Education
 English Education
 Foreign Language Education
 French
 German
 Health Education
 Health & Physical Education
 Home Economics Education
 Industrial Education
 Industrial Arts Education
 Mathematics Education
 Music Education
 Physical Education
 Science Education
 Secondary Education
 Social Science Education
 Spanish
 Special Education
 Vocational Home Economics Education

Standard II B -- Other Baccalaureate Major Fields (Universities)

Accounting Technology	Accreditation Council for Accountancy Examination
Agribusiness	Local
Agriculture, General	ETS Bank Local
Aerospace	Local
Aerospace Engineering	Engineer in Training Exam
Agricultural Economics	Cooperative Test
Animal Science	Local
Architectural Technology	Local
Art	?
Biology	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Business, General	Business Cooperative Test ETS Business Assessment Test
Business Administration	Business Cooperative Test ETS Business Field Test ETS Business Assessment Test

Business Finance	Business Cooperative Test ETS Business Field Test ETS Business Assessment Test
Chemical Engineering	Engineer in Training Exam
Chemistry	ETS Major Field Achievement Test American Chemical Society Examinations
Computer Science & Info. Systems	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Computer Systems Technology	Local
Criminal Justice	Local
Economics	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Electrical Engineering Tech	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Engineering	Engineer in Training Examination
Engineering Science	Engineer in Training Examination
English	ETS Major Field Achievement Test ETS Major Field Achievement Test in Literature ETS Language Skills Test
English-Journalism	Local
Environmental Health	Registered Professional Environmentalist Examination
Geography	?
Geology	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
German	Deutsches Zertifikat (German) from Goethe Institute.
History	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Home Economics	National Home Economics Senior Exit Examination Local
Industrial Engineering	Engineer in Training Examination
Industrial Technology	Local
Information Systems	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Journalism	Local

Management	ETS Business Assessment Test ETS Business Field Test Core Curriculum Assessment Pgm.
Manufacturing Tech.	Manufacturing Engineering Fundamentals Exam
Marketing	ETS Business Assessment Test ETS Business Field Test Core Curriculum Assessment Pgm.
Mass Communication	Local
Mathematics	ETS Major Field Achievement Test Mathematics Association of America Exam Putnam Examination
Mechanical Engineering Tech	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Music	?
Nuclear Engineering	Engineer in Training Examination
Office Admin./Mgmt.	ETS Business Field Test Certified Professional Secretary
Political Science	ETS Major Field Achievement Test Political Science Cooperative Test
Philosophy	?
Physical Education	Local
Physics	ETS Major Field Achievement Test
Plant/Soil Science	Local
Psychology	Psychology Cooperative Test
Recording Industry Management	Local
Recreation	Local
Social Work	Social Work Cooperative Test Local
Sociology	ETS Major Field Achievement Test Local
Speech/Theatre	Local
Spanish	Local

Standard II B -- Other Major Fields (Two-Year Institutions)

Accounting Technology	Cooperative Test
Biomedical Engineering Tech	Local
Building Construction Tech	Local
Business Related Technology	Cooperative Test
Business Tech: Accounting	Local
Chemical Technology	Local
Computer Accounting Tech	Local
Computer Engineering Tech.	Local
Computer Int. Draft & Design	Local
Computer Operations Tech	Local
Computer Science/Data Processing	Cooperative Test Local
Criminal Science/Justice Service/ Police Science Technology	Local Cooperative Test
Drafting Design Tech	Local
Early Childhood Educ. Tech.	Local
Electrical Tech	Standardized Occupational Competency Achievement Test of National Competency Testing Institute
Electronic Tech	Local
Electronic Tech (Instrumentation Engin. Tech.)	Instrument Technician Test Series of Instrument Society of America
Hotel/Restaurant Mgmt. Tech.	Local
Industrial Electronic Rel. Tech	Local
Industrial Maintenance Tech	Local
Machine Tool Technology	Standardized Occupational Competency Achievement Test of National Competency Testing Institute

Management Technology

Cooperative Test
Local

Marketing Technology

Cooperative Test

Mechanical Technology

Local

Secretarial Science/Office Admin. Cooperative Test