The University of Tennessee

Institute of Agriculture

AgResearch
College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
College of Veterinary Medicine
UT Extension

Unit Reviews

Office of the Chancellor, UTIA

UTIA Manual v12.docx

FOREWORD

Academic Program Reviews at The University of Tennessee date back to 1974, when a regular review of doctoral programs was initiated. In 1979, this was expanded to include undergraduate and master's-level work, and since then the program has evolved to a comprehensive examination of each academic unit held once every ten years. Beginning with FY 2009-2010 the Institute of Agriculture (UTIA) assumes the responsibility of conducting program reviews for its units. The review process developed by the UTIA draws from the review processes of University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Office of the Provost and the US Department of Agriculture Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service.

Unit Review is the primary means we have to evaluate the effectiveness of our units in teaching, research, creative activity, Extension/outreach and service. The UTIA administration participates in the reviews and treats both the process and the outcomes very seriously. Documents from the reviews, including the self-study, reviewers' reports, and follow-up discussions, are archived in the Office of the Chancellor, UTIA, and the various deans' offices and are referred to frequently. Even though availability of funds limits implementation of all recommendations, Unit Review reports are considered when budget allocations are being made.

The people whose work makes each review happen — the academic units that participate in the process, the staff members who organize schedules, and the external and internal reviewers who share their expertise and judgment — are fulfilling an important role for the university. To them, we extend our appreciation for their contributions to improvement of the academic mission of The University of Tennessee.

Office of the Chancellor

UTIA

Table of Contents

Section I • Unit Reviews

Unit reviews[1] are designed to improve the unit's standing within its discipline(s), service to clientele and programs in research, teaching, Extension, and outreach, to achieve the best use of available resources, and to foster cooperation among all units. Reviews serve as a means to evaluate quality, productivity, need, and demand within the university, state, and region; to determine effectiveness and consider possible modifications; and to facilitate planning and budgeting. They bring to each unit the advantages of assessment from the perspective of peers outside the institution and colleagues from other units within the university. In the case of those units which undergo accreditation review, these reviews may meet those needs, as well.

Background

UT's structure for academic program reviews has evolved over the last three decades, with the first comprehensive program review begun in October 1974. From then until 1979, reviews were conducted on behalf of the Graduate Council and administered by the Dean for Graduate Studies. While the initial focus was on doctoral programs, in late 1979 the review process was expanded to include master's and baccalaureate programs as well. Program reviews were coordinated by the Provost's Office, sharing the planning, conduct, and follow-up process with the academic unit and its college. Beginning in September 1987, an eight-year cycle for program reviews was adopted, along with a system for mid-cycle evaluations. A ten-year cycle for full reviews was initiated in 1998, with a mid-cycle evaluation occurring approximately three years after each full review. In 2008, the Office of the Provost transferred authority to the Office of the Vice President (now Chancellor) for all faculty-led programs in the Institute of Agriculture. With the transfer, unit reviews include all missions of the units, and includes those units that do not offer baccalaureate, graduate or professional degrees and mid-cycle reviews were scheduled to occur five years after the full-cycle review.

Unit review teams examine programs in depth, and the recommendations contained in their reports are important in supporting change and a process of continual improvement. The emphasis of the review process is on improving quality through candor, cooperation, and

---

[1] A companion document exists for administrative units which do not have faculty (.i.e., deans' offices, services, marketing and communications). This document describes procedures used to review units where the faculty conducts their intellectual work and scholarship.

communication. A summary document outlining unit, department, Deans' offices, Chancellor's Office, and university commitments to program improvements is one outcome of the review and follow-up meetings. Implementation of proposed changes is evaluated by the mid-cycle review.

Responsibilities

The unit review process requires close collaboration by numerous offices and individuals. The successful conduct of a review therefore involves shared responsibilities, as does the subsequent implementation of recommendations.

Review Coordinator

From initial planning through implementation, reviews are a joint responsibility of the Office of the UTIA Chancellor, the individual unit under review, and the respective deans' offices. A member of the UTIA administrative team is named by the Chancellor to serve as Review Coordinator. Dates for individual reviews are established in consultation with the unit administrator within the general timeframe set by the unit review calendar.

The Coordinator then holds initial planning sessions with the unit administrator and other appropriate individuals, and appoints internal and external reviewers. The Coordinator works with the unit to establish the review team schedule. The Coordinator receives the self-study document for distribution to the UTIA Administrative Team, appropriate UTK administrators, and the review team. The Coordinator receives the report of the review team, distributes it to participating individuals and units, and schedules and participates in the follow-up process (in concert with the unit administrator and the Deans and Chancellor).

The UTIA Administrative Team

The UTIA Administrative Team is composed of the Chancellor, Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, and Directors, as appropriate for the unit under review. The appropriate Deans and Chancellor, or their designates, participate in the initial planning of the review, setting review objectives, and nominating individuals to serve as external and internal reviewers, and meeting with the review team during the review itself. After the distribution of the reviewers' report, the Deans and Chancellor receive a copy of the unit's response to the report and may provide additional commentary. The Chancellor chairs the follow-up meeting, helps to incorporate the review findings into the annual planning and budgeting process of the Institute,

and has primary responsibility for implementation of the plan of action. The Deans and the Coordinator share responsibility for planning and implementation of the mid-cycle review.

The Unit

The UTIA recognizes that units under review may not necessarily align with the organizational chart (e.g., cross-department interdisciplinary teams). Therefore, a unit may be

1. an academic department with research, teaching, Extension and/or outreach functions

2. interdisciplinary units that cross existing administrative units such as departments or colleges; examples being the biofuels initiative or the CVM Hospital

3. non-degree granting units; examples being 4-H, Family and Consumer Sciences, or a Research and Education Center.

In planning a review, the unit administrator participates in establishing the review dates. When feasible, these may be adjusted to coincide with accreditation or other reviews by external agencies or pentannual review of the unit administrator. The unit administrator engages faculty and staff in a self-study of the unit (see self-study guidelines and forms in Appendix I, page 18), recommends a list of appropriate external and internal reviewers, prepares a draft schedule for confirmation by the Coordinator, and plans reviewers' travel, hotel accommodations, and local transportation. The unit administrator oversees the final preparation and duplication, as a CD or bound-paper document, of the self-study document and meets with the review team during the review.

After receipt of the review team report, the unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty and/or staff, responds in a written statement to the Coordinator and participates in the follow-up session.

Faculty and staff members in the program under review are an integral part of the review process. They have the responsibility to make significant contribution and input and to present information in the self-study document and are encouraged to participate in all aspects of the review process, including the review and its follow-up.

The Review Team

Two or three external reviewers and two or three internal reviewers normally compose the five-member review team. Team composition and size is based on the nature and needs of

the unit being reviewed. External reviewers are professionals in the field under review, and at least one is from a university. In cases of accreditation and/or professional certification or licensure, the second reviewer may be a practicing certified or licensed professional outside of academe. External reviewers from other universities should be from peer or aspirational peer institutions of the unit. Internal reviewers are often selected from disciplines closely related to the program under review, although this is not a requirement, and may come from UT units outside the UTIA. The wisdom and experience of a faculty member from a "distant" discipline may provide a valuable perspective.

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty, provides a prioritized list of potential reviewers to the Coordinator. The dean(s) and Chancellor also nominate reviewers. The Coordinator will finalize the list with the unit administrator. The Coordinator will then extend invitations to the potential reviewers.

The review team has the following responsibilities:

1. Before the review visit, all team members are expected to read carefully the self-study document and to note questions and concerns to be addressed during the review visit.

2. All team members participate fully in the meetings.

3. For those units under review that have responsibility for academic degree programs, at the conclusion of the review, external reviewers complete and sign the checklist forms required as part of program evaluation related to Performance Funding (see Appendices II, page 55, and III, page 59, for copies of these forms).

4. The team agrees upon an outline of its report, develops a draft of the report, and shares its major findings and recommendations in separate Concluding Sessions with 1) unit faculty and staff and 2) UTIA administration and appropriate UTK administrators, all before adjourning on the last day of the review.

5. All team members contribute to a single final written report, which is sent to the Coordinator within three to four weeks of the conclusion of the review. A suggested report outline is included in Appendix IV (page 62).

Performance Funding

Initiated by the state of Tennessee in 1979, Performance Funding offers a means of rewarding public institutions of higher education according to indicators established in

consultation with campus representatives and staff of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). State appropriations for Performance Funding amount to several millions of dollars for UT annually. The comprehensive evaluation of academic programs for Performance Funding comes through unit reviews, where the external reviewers complete forms contained in Appendices II (page 55) and III (page 59) that are submitted with UT's annual Performance Funding Report.

Components of the Unit Review Self-Study Document[1]

1. Unit characteristics
    a. Coverage of the discipline: general or focused/specialized
    b. Emphasis: basic, theoretical or applied; teaching, research, Extension programming, and professional service
    c. Curriculum including student learner outcomes, assessment and improvement
    d. Unique features
    e. International dimensions or perspectives: faculty, students, curriculum
    f. Off-campus, non-traditional teaching beyond Extension programming
    g. Admissions and retention: standards, attrition, enrollment trends
2. Centrality of the unit to the UTIA and university mission
    a. Relationship to other units and possibilities for cooperative arrangements with other units
    b. Contribution to general education for undergraduates
    c. Inter-institutional relationships
3. Unit quality
    a. Unit goals/objectives for instruction, research, Extension and professional service
    b. Status of accreditation and other outside assessments of the unit and its programs
    c. Quality of instruction and advising
    d. Nature and quality of the faculty and staff, if appropriate
    e. Nature and quality of the students

---

[1] Units should address those components that are appropriate to the unit. For example, those units that do not offer an academic degree program would not need to address admissions and retention of students.

     f. Nature and quality of the curriculum and/or courses in non-traditional or distance education formats

     g. Nature and quality of Extension programming

     h. Quality of the unit as reflected by student evaluations, peer evaluations, standardized tests, alumni and/or employer evaluations, client and/or stakeholder evaluations, national rankings or status within region, achievements of students and alumni, or other appropriate measures.

4. Unit support and resources

     a. Financing: institutional (state, Federal, and private giving) and external (grants and contracts)

     b. Support personnel

     c. Laboratory facilities and equipment

     d. Library resources

     e. Computer services

     f. Space and facilities maintenance

5. Unit administration

     a. Organization, committee structure, management, direction

     b. Faculty contribution; evidence of shared governance

     c. Strategic planning process and actions

     d. Student contribution

     e. Staff contribution

6. Diversity issues

     a. Faculty, staff, students, curriculum, Extension programming

     b. On-going efforts

     c. Achievements and plans

7. International infusion

     a. Curriculum

     b. Research initiatives

     c. Extension programming

8. Intellectual environment

     a. Support for professional development of faculty and/or staff

9. Overall effectiveness

Timetable for Review

The following are major steps in the review process. A summary of responsibilities for the entire process is included as Appendix V (page 64).

1. The Coordinator and the unit administrator establish dates for the review visit.

2. The Coordinator requests UT Libraries' Collections Department or the director of the Pendergrass Agricultural and Veterinary Medicine Library to make an evaluation of library holdings relevant to the program under review.

3. Potential external and internal reviewers are nominated by the unit and approved by the Deans and Chancellor. The Coordinator contacts all reviewers.

4. A draft schedule for the review is developed by the unit administrator and confirmed by the Coordinator. (See Appendix VII, page 67, for a Program Review Model Schedule. The unit should feel free to adjust the schedule, in consultation with the Coordinator, to fit the needs of the unit.) Responsibility for meetings and other arrangements is assigned. The unit administrator handles lodging and travel arrangements for the external reviewers and arranges for payment and reimbursement for external consultants' expenses by the UTIA Administrative Team, which is responsible for all expenses associated with the review. Local transportation is provided by the unit under review.

5. Five weeks before the review visit, the unit under review submits the appropriate number of copies of the self-study document (on a CD or a bound-paper document) to the Coordinator. These are distributed by the Coordinator to the review team members, the UTIA Administrative Team, and other appropriate offices in UTK administration four weeks before the review visit (see Appendix IX, page 77, for a list of participating offices and administrators).

6. On the first morning of the review visit, the team assembles for an orientation session with appropriate administrators and the Coordinator. (External consultants usually arrive in Knoxville the evening before.) The team then visits the unit for two to three days, for a schedule which includes interviews with the unit administrator, faculty members, staff members, students, UTIA and appropriate UTK administrators, and personnel from related programs.

7. The concluding day of the review visit includes a working session which provides time for the team to develop the outline of its report before meeting with the faculty and staff of the unit and UTIA Administration Team along with appropriate representatives from UTK during the two Concluding Sessions to discuss preliminary findings, including any recommendations for improving the review process. The verbal report should be succinct and take approximately half the time allocated for the session in order to allow time for questions. The review team usually develops a substantial draft of the report at the working session. Before departure, the external reviewers complete the Program Review Checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as required for Performance Funding), returning the forms to the Coordinator. They also make arrangements with the unit administrator for reimbursement of expenses and honoraria.

8. Within three or four weeks of the review visit, the team sends its final written report to the Coordinator, who then shares the document with the unit administrator and others who received the self-study document (see Appendix IX, page 77).

9. Within one month, the unit administrator submits a written response to the review report, addressing the observations and recommendations it contains and suggesting appropriate actions to be taken. The Coordinator distributes the departmental response to offices that originally received the self-study document and review report (see Appendix IX, page 77).

10. The coordinator arranges a final meeting with the unit administrator, the Deans, and the Chancellor, to determine which recommendations of the review committee are the highest priority for the department, UTIA, and university.

11. The Coordinator prepares brief minutes of this meeting that contain pertinent recommendations and proposed actions. Once this document is complete, it becomes the focus for the subsequent mid-cycle review and is shared with the Deans, Chancellor, and unit administrator.

Ten-Year Full-Cycle Unit Review Timeline for Planning and Conducting Review

12 months before the review
- The Coordinator and Unit Administrator hold the initial planning meeting to establish date for the review per the timetable and identify internal and external reviewers
- Unit Administrator organizes the unit to develop self study document

11 months before the review
- The Coordinator forwards names to the UTIA Administrative Team for review and approval.
- Coordinator contacts reviewers and finalizes the team; sends confirming letters.
- The Coordinator notifies the Pendergrass Ag & Vet Med Library for evaluation of library holdings relevant to the program.

5 weeks before the review
- Unit Administrator submits the final document to the Coordinator, who distributes self-study document to appropriate personnel (see Appendix IX)

Review
- Review team arrives and conducts the review
- Prior to departure, the review team completes Program Review Checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as required by THEC) for those units offering degree programs (see Appendices II and III)

4 weeks after review
- Review team submits final report to the Coordinator
- Coordinator distributes report to the Unit Administrator, UTIA Administrative Team, and others as appropriate (see Appendix IX)

8 weeks after review
- Unit Administrator submits unit's response to the review report
- Coordinator distributes the response to UTIA Administrative Team and others as appropriate (see Appendix IX)

10 to 12 weeks after review
- Coordinator schedules the follow-up meeting with the Unit Administrator, UTIA Administrataive Team and others as appropriate (see Appendix IX)

12 to 13 weeks after review
- Coordinator prepares minutes of the meeting and distributes to all participants

Reports Generated By the Unit Review and Responsible Entity

- Self-study document (Unit Administrator)

- Reviewers' report (Review team)

- Performance Funding checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as applicable) (Review team)

- Unit's response to review team's report (Unit Administrator)

- Summary document (Coordinator of Unit Reviews)

Section II • Mid-Cycle Reviews

As a follow-up on the implementation of recommendations from the unit review and as an indicator of current status, a mid-cycle review is conducted approximately five years after the full review. The mid-cycle review, a joint undertaking of the Office of the Chancellor and the Deans, includes the following actions:

1. One of the external team members is invited by the Coordinator to return to campus to work with the internal reviewers for a period of one to two days.

2. In advance, the reviewers reexamine all previously prepared materials, plus a brief statement of post-review accomplishments and continuing concerns prepared by the unit administrator, with the assistance of appropriate faculty, specifically for the mid-cycle review.

3. Meetings are held with appropriate department, institute, and university personnel to verify the unit's current status, prospects, and problems. At the conclusion of the mid-cycle review, the reviewers complete the Program Review Checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs and provide those to the Coordinator. A brief report evaluating progress achieved and overall effectiveness of the unit review process is submitted by the review team within three weeks after the visit.

A schedule of mid-cycle reviews is maintained by the review coordinator.

Responsibilities

The summary document that results from consideration of all unit review materials forms the basis for the subsequent mid-cycle review. The mid-cycle review is scheduled approximately five years from the initial visit.

The Coordinator

The Coordinator works with the unit administrator and UTIA Administrative Team to implement the mid-cycle review. In a planning meeting set approximately 6-12 months before the review date, the Coordinator, unit administrator and others as appropriate, discuss the overall responsibilities and procedures for the mid-cycle review. The Coordinator contacts the external and internal reviewers to request their participation and confirms dates. The unit administrator makes all travel and other arrangements for the review. The Coordinator

distributes the original review reports, the summary meeting minutes, the unit update report, and mid-cycle review schedule to review participants and other appropriate persons (see Appendix IX, page 77).

During the review, the Coordinator and unit administrator work with the review team to guide the process. The Coordinator chairs the orientation meeting and concluding session. After the chair of the review team submits the mid-cycle report, the Coordinator distributes copies to the unit administrator, the Deans and Chancellor, internal reviewers, and other participants (see Appendix IX, page 77).

The UTIA Administrative Team

The UTIA Administrative Team shares responsibility with the Coordinator for planning and implementation of the mid-cycle review. Due to the compressed schedule for the mid-cycle review, the Chancellor hosts the dinner scheduled at the end of the first day. In conjunction with the unit administrator, the Chancellor concludes the mid-cycle review by addressing the recommendations in the reviewers' report.

The Unit

While planning for the mid-cycle review, the unit administrator prepares an update report of no more than 10 pages to summarize changes that have occurred in the unit since the full review. This report focuses on changes resulting from unit review recommendations as noted in the summary document, and should include other changes as well. A mid-cycle model schedule is contained in Appendix VIII, page 73 (units should feel free to adjust the schedule, in consultation with the Coordinator, to fit the needs of the unit). In consultation with the Coordinator and Deans, the unit administrator is responsible for scheduling and arranging all meetings, contacting those who will participate and reserving rooms for meetings.

The Review Team

The three internal reviewers and one of the external reviewers from the original unit review compose the mid-cycle review team. If an original reviewer is not available to participate, the Coordinator, in concert with the unit administrator and deans, identifies and enlists other faculty members to create a review team with a minimum of three members. The external member serves as chair of the mid-cycle review team and coordinates production of the final report.

Using the unit review findings and unit update, the mid-cycle review team assesses the progress made by the unit, the UTIA, and UTK, if appropriate, in addressing earlier recommendations. Within three weeks of the visit, the review team submits a brief written report to the Coordinator, commenting on progress made in addressing the plan of action as stated in the summary document and any other pertinent findings, even if not related to the original review. In anticipation of the next unit review, the team should raise questions for the unit to address about the program's effectiveness in reaching goals and objectives.

Mid-Cycle Review Timeline for Planning and Conducting Review

12 months before the review	•The Coordinator and Unit Administrator hold the initial planning meeting to establish date for the mid-cycle review per the timetable and identify internal and external reviewers •Unit Administrator organizes the unit to develop report that addresses the Summary Report of the Full-Cycle Review
11 months before the review	•Coordinator contacts reviewers and finalizes the team; sends confirming letters.
5 weeks before the review	•Unit Administrator submits the mid-cycle report to the Coordinator, who distributes it to appropriate personnel (see Appendix IX)
Review	•Review team arrives and conducts the review •Prior to departure, the review team completes Program Review Checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (as required by THEC) for those units offering degree programs (see Appendices II and III)
3 weeks after review	•Review team submits their report to the Coordinator •Coordinator distributes report to the Unit Administrator, UTIA Administrative Team, and others as appropriate (see Appendix IX)
4 to 5 weeks after review	•Coordinator schedules the follow-up meeting with the Unit Administrator, UTIA Administrative Team and others as appropriate (see Appendix IX)

Appendix I • Self-Study Document: Narrative and Common Data Sets

Reviews are most helpful if they are developed in conjunction with the strategic planning process of the institution and the unit to be reviewed. Generally, reviews are conducted to assist units as they plan for the future and adjust to changes occurring locally, regionally or nationally as compared with a review of the past work. Therefore, the self-study needs to be grounded in the unit's mission, vision and strategic plan. The review provides the unit the opportunity to review progress towards meeting its mission and strategic plan, and to propose modifications to its mission, vision and strategic plan that take into account changes in the discipline, economy, and society on a state, regional, national and/or international level since the previous review. The common data sets and guided narratives are required to place the program in context of the UTIA.

Each unit prepares a Self-Study Document prior to the review so that copies may be distributed to members of the review team and others at least four weeks before the on-campus visit. The purpose of the document is to acquaint the team with the programs, personnel, accomplishments, future plans, and the areas on which to focus the review. The self-study should be written only after frank and open discussion by faculty in the unit as they prepare for the review. The self-study document may be submitted electronically on CD or as a bound, paper document.

What follows are guidelines for preparing the self-study document and conducting the review to meet the needs of the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Given the differences among the units and diversity of programs, the outline cannot apply equally to all, so units should feel free to adjust its content as necessary; however, when specific format guidelines are given, these should be followed. In writing the report, units should respond to considerations listed in Section D as well as to all the items included on the Performance Funding checklists for graduate and undergraduate programs (Appendices II, page 55, and III, page 59). The self-study should be a concise summary, rather than an exhaustively detailed report. Supplemental information should be placed in appendices and may be made available in a resource room at the time of the Unit Review.

1. Description of the Unit

Vision and mission	Provide the mission and vision statements
	Provide a copy of the strategic plan (if lengthy, provide only the executive summary)
Scope, emphasis, and structure	Breadth and depth of program
	Describe emphasis on preparation for teaching, research, Extension, and/or public/professional service
	Shared governance, planning efforts, committee and team effectiveness
Special features	Unique components, distinctive innovations
Diversity initiatives	Curriculum, students, faculty, staff
Curriculum	Nature and quality, general goals and overview
	Student learner outcomes (see Table 1, page 25 for format), assessment of outcomes and improvements made based upon assessment
	Assessment of curriculum and quality of instruction
Enrichment opportunities	Interdisciplinary collaborations and initiatives – how we support each other.
	Special events, activities and programs that enhance the academic environment and quality of the program, such as a lecture series of visiting faculty
General education	Contributions to undergraduate general education, as appropriate
Connections	Relationships with other units on campus, outside constituents, professional community, industry groups, etc.
Non-traditional instruction	Distance and continuing education efforts
Faculty	Overall description related to strengths and specialties
	Efforts for faculty recruitment, development, and mentoring
	Workloads
Admissions/retention	Undergraduate admissions standards and procedures
	Graduate admissions standards and procedures
	Recruitment efforts
	Retention efforts
	Diversity efforts
Accreditation	Status as applicable

1. Description of the Unit

History and background	Overview of the unit within the context of the UTIA and University of Tennessee
	Critical events/background information which will help in understanding the unit
Demand for program	Community, state, regional, national, and international demand, as appropriate

2. Centrality of the Unit to University and Institute Mission

Teaching	Teaching loads – 14-day data set (see Table 2, page 26, for format)
	Nature and quality of efforts in teaching
	Key student learning outcomes – what are they, how are they measured, what are the findings, how are the findings used for improvement, what improvements have been made since the last review (see Table 1, page 25 for format).
	Process to evaluate teaching outcomes (e.g., results of comprehensive examination, major field test, California Critical Thinking Skills Test scores, regional/national competitions, documentation of placement and career success of graduates, etc.)
	Summary course evaluations (see Table 3, page 27, for format)
	Assessment of teaching by students, faculty, alumni
	Nature of graduate theses and dissertations
	Innovations and efforts to improve teaching
Advising	Nature of undergraduate and graduate student advising
	Student to advisor ratio
	Effectiveness of advising
	Innovations and efforts to improve advising
	Service related to advising student organizations including honor societies, service groups, clubs, competition teams, fraternities or sororities
Extension Program	Nature of the Extension Program: efforts and impacts related to the appropriate State Action Agendas
	Quality of outreach, community service, and Extension programming as demonstrated by impacts of the programs.
	Interrelationship of Extension programming with undergraduate and graduate student engagement with Extension programs, research and other aspects of the unit
Research Program	Nature of the research program
	Interrelationship of research with undergraduate and graduate education, Extension programming and other aspects of the program

2. Centrality of the Unit to University and Institute Mission

Professional Service	Nature and quality of service to the university and discipline
Quality Enhancement Plan	International and Intercultural Awareness Initiative: Indicate ways in which the unit is contributing to the goals of the QEP
Diversity Plan	Indicate the ways in which the unit is contributing to the goals of the UTIA Diversity Plan
Consortial relations	The SACS accreditation process mandates that we "ensure the quality of educational programs/courses offered through consortial relationships or contractual agreements and that the institution evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the purpose of the institution." Please list any consortium or contractual relationships your department has with other institutions as well as the mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of these relationships.

3. Quality (based on evidence from the past 5 years)

National recognition	Rankings if applicable
	NRC ranking of department's graduate program compared to THEC peer institutions
	Other peer assessment
Faculty productivity	Books and book chapters authored by faculty
	Refereed articles and presentations by faculty
	Invited lectures by faculty
	National and international awards to faculty (see Table 4, page 28, for format)
	Research proposals and awards (the appropriate office will provide standardized report which will include information on awards by PI, as well as information about the number of proposals submitted and funded, and federal and corporate grants and awards. Comparative figures for the Institute will also be furnished).
	Citation indices
	Instruction manuals and instructional technology modules
	Patents and invention disclosures
	Other indications of faculty work

3. Quality (based on evidence from the past 5 years)

Faculty (tenure and non-tenure track) profile	Faculty turnover data (see Table 5, page 29, for format)
	Percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty with terminal degree (see Table 6, page 30, for format)
	Percent of non-tenure track faculty with terminal degree (see Table 6, page 30, for format).
	Percent of faculty approved to teach in the doctoral program and approved to direct doctoral students (see Table 6, page 30, for format)
	Percent holding professional certifications or licenses required to practice the discipline (if appropriate) (see Table 6, page 30, for format)
	International teaching, Extension, research and/or outreach experience
	Other measures to indicate quality
Staff profile	Types of staff positions
	Distribution and assignment of professional, clerical and technical staff
	Qualifications of professional, clerical and technical staff
Student profile	Nature and quality of undergraduate and graduate students, using best available data.
	For undergraduates in the last 5 years: number of majors, entering student ACT/SAT scores and HS GPA, number of applications, % applicants accepted, % applicants matriculated, % women, % minority, % international, retention rate, 14-day student count, number of degrees awarded (see Table 7, page 31, for format)
	For graduate and professional students in the last 5 years; average GRE score, entering student GPA, number of applications, % applicants accepted, % applicants matriculated, % women, % minority, % international, 14-day student count, number of degrees awarded, average time to degree (see Table 7, page 31, for format)
Student support	Scholarships and assistantships
	Number and level of graduate, post-doctoral, and clinical resident students stipends
Student recognition	For undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, number of refereed and other articles (see Table 8a, page 34, for format); presentations at regional, national and international conferences; awards (individual or team); campus, regional or national recognitions; internal and external fellowships, and competitive fellowships (see Tables 8b, page 35, and 8d, page 37, for format)
	For undergraduate students, list of students and their honor thesis titles and mentors (see Table 8c, page 36, for format); for graduate students, list of students and their theses and/or dissertation titles and mentors (see Table 8e, page 38, for format)

3. Quality (based on evidence from the past 5 years)

Placement	For undergraduate, graduate, and professional students: number and types of placement into industry, government, NGO, graduate schools, professional schools, post-doctoral appointments or academic appointments (provide name of institution and department) (see Tables 9a, page 39, and 9b, page 41, for format)
Student performance	Measures of student accomplishments (major field tests, licensure scores, California Critical Thinking Skills Test scores, etc.)
Other graduate/professional program indicators	Annual production of degrees (DVM, Master, PhD) (see Table 7, page 31, for format) Average time to degree completion (DVM, Master, PhD) (see Table 8e, page 38, for format)

4. Resources (based on financial and enrollment data from the past 5 years)

Academic unit statistics	Data such as student credit hours, number of degrees, numbers of faculty and graduate student FTEs, budgeted expenses and incomes, sponsored project expenditures, F&A return and comparative data for UTIA units, are available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance, and the various UTIA Offices of the Dean.
Budget data	E01, E11, E12, and E18 data for five years (see Table 10a, page 42, for format) Grants and contracts annual expenditures (identify as research, teaching, Extension, clinical or outreach and source see Table 10b, page 44, for format) Development funds annual expenditures (identify as research, teaching, Extension, clinical or outreach; see Table 10c, page 46, for format) Total expenditures and ratio of E&G funds to total program expenditures (see Table 10d, page 48, for format) Ratio of research expenditures per FTE faculty (see Table 10e, page 49, for format)
Space	Scope and quality of space for program needs
Computing support	Equipment and technical support for faculty, staff and students
Library support	Assessment of library holdings and services
Unit structure	Organizational chart of the unit, indicating all personnel
Program administration	Organization, management, direction, and faculty governance

5. Summary perspective

Speculations	Challenge the paradigms of the unit Possible recombination with other campus units Options for change Future opportunities related to the UTIA's areas of focus
Strengths	Internal and external
Weaknesses	Internal and external
Future goals and plans	Plan for the next 10-year review cycle
Diversity	Faculty, staff, graduate, undergraduate and professional student demographics [see Tables 11a (page 51), 11b (page 52), and 11c (page 53) for format] Plans to promote diversity in curriculum, students, faculty, staff, and outreach programming
Special concerns	Any items the unit review should address
Special information	Particular information for evaluation of the unit

6. Appendices

Faculty (tenure and non-tenure track) vitae	Abbreviated (2-page) CV for each faculty member
Professional, technical and clerical staff	Abbreviated (2-page) CV for each professional, technical, and clerical staff member
Other	During the review team visit, provide self-study supplemental materials, which may include course syllabi, accreditation reports, previous academic/unit review reports, admissions publications, advising documents, annual departmental reports, departmental newsletters, significant publications and other educational media, etc.

Table 1. Alignment of student outcomes with courses in the curriculum.

1.											
2.											
3.											
4.											
5.											
6.											
7.											
8.											
9.											
10.											
Course number & name	Assessment tool or project										

NOTES:

1. List the learner outcome on lines numbered 1 through 10. Modify table if there are fewer than or greater than 10 learner outcomes.

2. List each course and provide the assessment tool or project used in the course (insert lines if multiple items are used in a course).

3. Place an X in the appropriate box to indicate which learner objective is linked to the assessment tool or project in the appropriate course.

Table 2. Fourteen-day enrollment for courses taught over the past five years.

Course number	Course title	Instructor	No. of sections	Total enrollment by term									
				Fa05	Sp06	Fa06	Sp07	Fa07	Sp08	Fa08	Sp09	Fa09	Sp10
	EXAMPLE:												
100	Orientation to ANR	T. Cooper	1	42		45		46		52		55	

NOTES:

1. Courses

    a. For courses with multiple sections, combine enrollment in each section and provide one entry of the total enrollment in the course for each term offered.

    b. Dual-numbered courses should be entered as separate courses in order to distinguish between the numbers of students in each course.

    c. Cross-listed courses are listed regardless as to whether primary or secondary course; footnote the course and indicate which course is primary and secondary.

    d. Leave cells blank if course is not taught in given semester

    e. If course was cancelled, mark cell with the capital letter "X."

    f. Obtain 14-day enrollment figures by running 14-day enrollment management reports in SIS: IMSP>Student Information System>Timetable Main Menu>Reports Menu>Print Enrollment Management Reports

2. Instructors

    a. If team taught, list all instructors as listed in timetable.

    b. If course is taught by different instructors in different semesters, list separately.

3. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

Table 3. Summary course evaluations over the past five years.

Course number and title	Instructor	Term	Number of students completing evaluation	Course as a whole	Course content	Instructor's contribution	Instructor's effectiveness
				Items			
EXAMPLE							
328 Conservatories: Management, Operations and Display	Albrecht, Mary	SP 08	5	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.1
		SP 07	5	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3
		SP 06	5	4.0	4.4	4.5	4.5

NOTES:

1. List courses in numerical order

    a. Within each course, list from most recent term to oldest term (e.g., start with fall 2008 and go back through fall 2004)

    b. If there is more than one instructor, provide the evaluations for each instructor.

    c. Do not use abbreviations; give names as they appear in the catalog.

2. These items are the same items as required for tenure and promotion packages as described in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

3. Provide the name of the instructor as last name, first name.

Table 4. Regional, national and international awards received by faculty since last review

Faculty member	Year	Award	Grantor

NOTES:

1. List faculty alphabetically and for each faculty member, list awards chronologically.
2. Give full name of the award and grantor. For clarity, minimize abbreviations in names of organizations.
3. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

Table 5a. Faculty turnover history since the last review.

Year	Faculty Member	Rank	Reason for separation	New institution and position

Table 5b. Faculty hires since the last review

Year	Faculty Member	Rank	Position filled	Previous institution and position

NOTES:

1. List separations chronologically and within each year, list faculty members alphabetically.
2. Reason for separation should be 1) denied tenure, 2) retirement, 3) resignation, or 4) death.
3. Provide the name of the new institution and position if the separation was a resignation.
4. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

Table 6. Faculty profile over the past 5 years as of August 1 of each fiscal year.

Measue	Fiscal years				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Total faculty FTE (no.)					
Tenure-track faculty with terminal degree[1] (%)					
Tenured faculty with terminal degree (%)					
Non-tenure track faculty with terminal degree[2] (%)					
Faculty approved to teach 600-level courses (%)					
Faculty approved to direct doctoral degrees (%)					
Faculty holding professional certifications or licenses[3] (%)					

NOTE: If faculty in the unit represent different disciplines, separate into appropriate tables, e.g. for the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, faculty may be separated into two disciplines – Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries – or three disciplines – Forestry, Wildlife, Fisheries. This may facilitate comparisons by the review team with peer institutions.

[1] Terminal degrees held by faculty in this unit include DVM, EDD, JD, MBA, MLA, PhD (edit footnote as appropriate for the unit)
[2] Non-tenure-track faculty includes instructor, lecturer, clinical, and research faculty titles.
[3] Includes Professional Engineer, Landscape Architecture, Law, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy or others as required by the discipline

Table 7. Undergraduate and graduate/professional student profile for the past 5 years.

Measure	Fiscal Year				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Undergraduate students					
Entering students average superscored ACT					
Entering students average high school core GPA					
Applications:					
Number of applicants (no.)					
Percent accepted					
Percent matriculated					
Percent women					
Percent minority					
Percent international					
14-day enrollment[1]					
Degrees awarded[1]					
Graduate students					
MS students[2]					
Entering students average GRE					
Entering students average GPA					
Applications:					
Number of applicants (no.)					
Percent accepted					

---

[1] Data available from the Office of the Dean; if faculty serve as the major advisor to students in other MS or PhD programs not affiliated with the unit, add separate lines to the table to indicate participation in other programs.

[2] For departments with more than one MS degree program, duplicate this section for each degree program; e.g. for the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, there would be two sections, one for the MS in Forestry and one for the MS in Wildlife and Fisheries Science. Each unit should modify the headings as appropriate to identify the degree programs.

Measure	Fiscal Year				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Percent matriculated					
Percent women					
Percent minority					
Percent international					
14-day enrollment[1]					
Degrees awarded[1]					
Graduate students					
Doctoral students					
Entering students average GRE					
Entering students average GPA					
Applications:					
Number of applicants (no.)					
Percent accepted					
Percent matriculated					
Percent women					
Percent minority					
Percent international					
14-day enrollment[1]					
Degrees awarded[1]					
Professional students[2]					
Entering students average GRE or VCAT score					

[1] Data available from the Office of the Dean; if faculty serve as the major advisor to students in other MS or PhD programs not affiliated with the unit, add separate lines to the table to indicate participation in other programs.
[2] Professional students = veterinary medicine, clinical resident, post-doctoral or landscape architecture students (advised by the Plant Sciences department). Each unit should edit, as appropriate, to identify degree program(s).

Measure	Fiscal Year				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Entering students average GPA					
Applications:					
Number of applicants (no.)					
Percent accepted					
Percent matriculated					
Percent women					
Percent minority					
Percent international					
14-day enrollment[1]					
Degrees awarded[1]					
Average time to degree					

NOTES:

1. Units should delete sections not needed or add sections for clinical resident or post-doctoral students, as appropriate.

2. If the table is modified, the table heading should be appropriately edited.

---

[1] Data available from the Office of the Dean; if faculty serve as the major advisor to students in other MS or PhD programs not affiliated with the unit, add separate lines to the table to indicate participation in other programs.

Table 8a. Undergraduate, graduate and professional student recognitions over the past five years.

	Academic year				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Undergraduate students					
Refereed articles (no.)					
Extension publications (no.)					
Other printed materials (no.)					
Presentations at scientific conferences (no.)					
Graduate students					
Refereed articles (no.)					
Extension publications (no.)					
Other printed materials (no.)					
Presentations at scientific conferences (no.)					
Professional students					
Refereed articles (no.)					
Extension publications (no.)					
Other printed materials (no.)					
Presentations at scientific conferences (no.)					

NOTES:

1. Units should modify as needed. If appropriate, include sections for post-doctoral and clinical resident students.

2. If the table is modified, the table heading should be appropriately edited.

Table 8b. Undergraduate student awards, fellowships, and other competitions (team or individual) over the past five years.

Mentor	Year	Student (name or names)	Recognition	Grantor

NOTES:

1. List prominent awards given at the university, state, regional, national or international level.

2. Sort by mentor alphabetically and within each mentor by year.

3. Provide each name of the student if a team competition. If a competition, provide placing.

4. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

5. If the unit does not award baccalaureate degree, this table should be included if faculty mentor students from other programs.

Table 8c. College and university honors theses completed by undergraduate students over the past five years.

Mentor	Year	Student	C or U[1]	Thesis title

NOTES:

1. List the thesis title for all undergraduate students completing the College (C) or University (U) Honors Program

2. Sort by mentor alphabetically and within each mentor by year.

3. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

4. If the unit does not award baccalaureate degree, this table should be included if faculty mentor students from other programs.

---

[1] Indicate C if the student completed the College Honors Program or U if the student completed the University Honors Program.

Table 8d. Graduate/professional student awards, fellowships, and other competitions (team or individual) over the past five years.

Mentor	Year	Student (name or names)	Recognition	Grantor

NOTE:

1. List prominent awards given at the university, state, regional, national or international level.

2. Sort by mentor alphabetically and within each mentor by year.

3. Provide each name of the student if a team competition. If a competition, provide placing.

4. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

5. If the unit does not award baccalaureate degree, this table should be included if faculty mentor students from other programs.

6. Unit should edit title, as appropriate, depending upon the type of student 1) graduate, 2) professional (DVM or MLA), 3) post-doctoral, or clinical resident students.

Table 8e. Graduate student theses and dissertations and non-thesis master-level students completed over the past five years.

Mentor	Year (start and end dates)[1]	Student[2]	Master or PhD[3]	Thesis or dissertation title or problem in lieu of thesis
Average time to degree				
MS degrees				
PhD degrees				

NOTE:

1. List the thesis/dissertation title for all graduate students completing the Master's or doctoral program. For non-thesis students, provide the title of the problem in lieu of thesis topic.

2. Sort by mentor alphabetically and within each mentor by term of entry of the student (i.e., FA 2003 would be listed before SP 2004).

3. To add lines for additional students, insert these lines above the "Average time to degree" line.

4. Units should include students enrolled in degree programs not associated with the unit (i.e., an agricultural economics faculty member may serve as major professor for a student earning a doctorate in economics).

---

[1] Specify the entry and graduation terms for each student. If the student did not complete the degree, enter the term of entry only; in the column for thesis or dissertation title, enter "Did not complete degree".
[2] If the student is enrolled in a major not associated with the unit (i.e., animal science faculty member is mentoring a student enrolled the doctoral degree in Comparative and Experimental Medicine), provide the name of the major after the student's name.
[3] Specify whether the student was a Master's student (MS-t for thesis, MS-n for non-thesis, MLA-t or MLA-n) or a doctoral student

Table 9a. Placement of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students upon graduation over the past 5 years.

	Academic Year[1]									
	05-06		06-07		07-08		08-09		09-10	
Undergraduate Student Placement										
BS degrees awarded (no.)										
Industry positions (no.)										
Government positions – Federal, state, and municipal (no.)										
Non-governmental organization positions (no.)										
Graduate school (no.)										
Professional school[2] (no.)										
Unknown status (no.)										
Professional Student Placement										
DVM or MLA degrees awarded (no.)										
Industry positions (no.)										
Government positions – Federal, state, and municipal (no.)										
Non-governmental organization positions (no.)										
Graduate school (no.)										
Professional school[3] (no.)										
Unknown status (no.)										
Graduate Student Placement	MS	PhD	MS	PhD	MS	PhD	MS	PhD	MS	PhD
Master or PhD degrees awarded (no.)										
Industry positions (no.)										
Government positions – Federal, state, and municipal (no.)										
Non-governmental organization positions (no.)										
Graduate school (no.)										

[1] Degrees awarded data available from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment by academic year (summer-fall-spring term total)
[2] Includes law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, physical therapy, veterinary medicine, landscape architecture, business administration
[3] Includes law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, physical therapy, veterinary medicine, landscape architecture, business administration

Professional school[2] (no.)										
Academic positions (no.)										
Post-doctoral positions (no.)										
Unknown status (no.)										

NOTE:

1. Unit should edit the table title and delete sections, as appropriate, in order to include any post-doctoral or clinical resident students.

Table 9b. Placement of graduate/professional students into academic and post-doctoral positions over the past 5 years.

Mentor	Year	Student	Position title	Institution name	Location

NOTES:

1. For each student, provide the full position title and the full name of the institution and city and state or country

2. Sort by mentor alphabetically and within each mentor by year the student graduated

3. Add lines as needed by tabbing in last column.

4. Unit should edit the table title, as appropriate, to include post-doctoral and clinical resident students.

Table 10a. E&G budget expenditures on June 30 over the past five fiscal years.

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
E01 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total E01 XXXX					
E11 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total E11 XXXX					
E12 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total E12 XXXX					
E18 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total E18 XXXX					

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Grand total					

NOTES:

1. For each unit, delete budget entities which do not apply to that unit
2. For each budget, provide full account number
3. Within each budget entity, insert additional lines as needed for the various G/L codes

Table 10b. Grant and contract budget expenditures on June 30 over the past five fiscal years.

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
R01 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R01 XXXX					
R11 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R11 XXXX					
R12 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R12 XXXX					
R18 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R18 XXXX					

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Grand total					

NOTES:

1. For each unit, delete budget entities which do not apply to that unit

2. For each budget, provide full account number.

3. Within each budget entity, insert additional lines as needed for the various G/L codes

Table 10c. Development and gift account budget expenditures on June 30 over the past five fiscal years.

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
R01 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R01 XXXX					
R11 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R11 XXXX					
R12 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R12 XXXX					
R18 XXXX					
Faculty					
GA/GRA/GTA					
Clerical Staff					
Professional Staff					
Operating					
Total R18 XXXX					

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Grand total					

NOTES:

1. For each unit, delete budget entities which do not apply to that unit

2. For each budget, provide full account number.

3. Within each budget entity, insert additional lines as needed for the various G/L codes

Table 10d. Total unit expenditures on June 30 over the past five fiscal years

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
E01-XXXX/E&G – 9a					
R01-XXXX/G&C – 9b					
R01-XXXX/Dev – 9c					
E11-XXXX/E&G – 9a					
R11-XXXX/G&C – 9b					
R11-XXXX/Dev – 9c					
E12-XXXX/E&G – 9a					
R12-XXXX/G&C – 9b					
R12-XXXX/Dev – 9c					
E18-XXXX/E&G – 9a					
R18-XXXX/G&C – 9b					
R18-XXXX/Dev – 9c					
Grand total					
E&G Funds as % Total Expenditures[1]					

NOTES:

1. For each unit, delete budget entities which do not apply to that unit

2. For each budget, provide full account number.

3. Provide total expenditures for the sum of each budget entity; do not provide by individual accounts

---

[1] E&G Funds as Percent of Total Expenditures as given in Table 9e

Table 10e. Total unit expenditures on June 30 over the past five fiscal years

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
T/TT faculty FTEs[1]					
E01-XXXX/E&G					
R01-XXXX/G&C					
R01-XXXX/Dev					
E11-XXXX/E&G					
R11-XXXX/G&C					
R11-XXXX/Dev					
E12-XXXX/E&G					
R12-XXXX/G&C					
R12-XXXX/Dev					
E18-XXXX/E&G					
R18-XXXX/G&C					
R18-XXXX/Dev					
Total T/TT faculty FTEs					
Non-tenure-track[2] faculty FTEs					
E01-XXXX/E&G					
R01-XXXX/G&C					
R01-XXXX/Dev					
E11-XXXX/E&G					
R11-XXXX/G&C					
R11-XXXX/Dev					
E12-XXXX/E&G					
R12-XXXX/G&C					
R12-XXXX/Dev					

---

[1] T/TT = Tenured and tenure-track faculty
[2] NT = Non-tenure track faculty such as instructor, lecturer, clinical faculty, and research faculty

Budget entity	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
E18-XXXX/E&G					
R18-XXXX/G&C					
R18-XXXX/Dev					
Total NT[1] faculty FTEs					
Total faculty FTEs[2]					
E01-XXXX/E&G					
R01-XXXX/G&C					
R01-XXXX/Dev					
E11-XXXX/E&G					
R11-XXXX/G&C					
R11-XXXX/Dev					
E12-XXXX/E&G					
R12-XXXX/G&C					
R12-XXXX/Dev					
E18-XXXX/E&G					
R18-XXXX/G&C					
R18-XXXX/Dev					
Grand total of faculty FTEs					

NOTE: For each unit, delete budget entities which do not apply; provide full account numbers.

---

[1] NT = Non-tenure track faculty such as instructor, lecturer, clinical faculty, and research faculty
[2] Total faculty FTEs = Tenure/tenure-track faculty FTEs plus Non-tenure track faculty FTEs

Table 11a. Diversity represented by the unit's faculty over the past five fiscal years.

Faculty (no.)	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					

NOTES:

1. Use faculty data as of July 1 of each fiscal year. Faculty should be separated into tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty, unless if by doing so may identify an individual.

2. For each unit, insert/delete lines as appropriate; if a specific racial or ethnic group is not represented, delete appropriate line.

Table 11b. Diversity represented by the unit's staff over the past five fiscal years.

	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Staff: Professional and technical (no.)					
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					
Staff: Clerical (no.)					
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					

NOTES:

1. Use staff data as of July 1 of each fiscal year.

2. Unit may separate staff into sections other than as given in the table. Unit should present data to best represent the types of staff positions in the unit.

3. For each unit, insert/delete lines as appropriate; if a specific racial or ethnic group is not represented, delete appropriate line.

Table 11c. Diversity represented by the unit's students over the past five fiscal years.

	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Graduate Students (no.)					
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					
Professional Students (no.)					
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					
Undergraduate Students (no.)					
White (percent)					
Black (percent)					
Asian (percent)					
Hispanic (percent)					
Native American (percent)					
Not reported (percent)					

	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Other (percent) *Please specify*					
Male (percent)					
Female (percent)					

NOTES:

1. Use 14-day official enrollment figures from fall semester of each year. Available from Office of the Dean.

2. For each unit, insert/delete lines as appropriate; if a specific racial or ethnic group is not represented, delete appropriate line. Unit may add or delete student groups (undergraduate, graduate, professional, post-doctoral, and clinical resident students) as needed.

Appendix II • Checklist for Undergraduate Programs

Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs

Institution: University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture
College of _____

Program: _____

Major title

_____

Degree Designation   *CIP Code*

Instructions for External Reviewers:

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

The criteria used to evaluate a program appear in the following "Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs." The Checklist consists of 30 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use the criteria designated with an asterisk (*) to assess standards in the baccalaureate programs. The remaining criteria, including all criteria in the fifth category, Support, will be used by the institution, but will not be included in the overall assessment reported to THEC.

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 determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether you believe that a program has "met" or "not met" each criterion within the six standards in the table that follows. If a particular criterion should be inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked "NA".

This evaluation becomes a part of the record of the academic program review. The checklist will be shared with the unit, Offices of the Dean, Office of the Vice President and other appropriate UTK offices, 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 (see standards 1-5) will be used in allocating state funds for the university's budget.

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

_____   _____
Name   Name

_____   _____
Title   Title

_____   _____
Institution   Institution

_____   _____
Signature   Date   Signature   Date

Institution: University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture
               College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Program:

Major title

Degree Designation   *CIP Code*

Checklist for Assessment of Baccalaureate Programs

Criteria for			Evaluation Results	
1. PROGRAM OUTCOMES			**Met**	**Not Met**
*	1.1	Intended program and learning outcomes are clearly identified.		
*	1.2	The program uses appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement of program outcomes.		
*	1.3	The unit makes use of information from its evaluation of program outcome attainment; student, alumni, and employer surveys; and university research to strengthen the program's effectiveness.		

2. CURRICULUM			**Met**	**Not Met**
*	2.1	The curriculum is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program.		
*	2.2	The curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly.		
*	2.3	Program requirements include a strong general education component.		
*	2.4	The curriculum includes a required core of appropriate courses in the discipline.		
	2.5	An appropriate balance is maintained between courses inside the major and outside the major.		
*	2.6	Curricular content reflects current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline.		
*	2.7	The curriculum encourages the development of critical thinking.		
*	2.8	The curriculum exposes students to appropriate research strategies fro the program area and students have the opportunity to participate in research.		
*	2.9	Students have opportunities to apply what they have learned to situations outside the classroom.		
*	2.10	Students are exposed to professional and career opportunities appropriate to the field.		

2. CURRICULUM	Met	Not Met
* 2.11 The program uses appropriate indicators to evaluate appropriate and sufficient achievement in service courses.		
* 2.12 Courses are offered regularly to ensure that students can make timely progress.		

3. TEACHING AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	Met	Not Met
* 3.1 The program's instructional practices are consistent with the standards of the discipline.		
* 3.2 As appropriate to the discipline, the program provides students with the opportunity for interaction with one another, faculty, and professionals in the field.		
* 3.3 Effective advising is provided by well-informed faculty and/or professional staff.		
* 3.4 Library holdings are current and adequate to meet students' needs.		
* 3.5 The program seeks to include the perspectives and experiences of underrepresented groups through curricular and extracurricular activities.		
* 3.6 Students have the opportunity to regularly evaluate faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.		

4. FACULTY	Met	Not Met
* 4.1 The faculty is adequate in number to meet the needs of the program with efficient teaching loads.		
4.2 As appropriate to the demographics of the discipline, the faculty are diverse with respect to gender, ethnicity, and academic background.		
* 4.3 Faculty are appropriately prepared for the level of the program, at least meeting SACS requirements for faculty preparation.		
* 4.4 Faculty are engaged in scholarly, creative, professional association, and service activities that enhance instructional expertise in their areas of specialty.		
4.5 Adjunct faculty meet the high standards set by the program and expected SACS qualifications and credentials.		
* 4.6 The unit uses a faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.		

5. SUPPORT			Met	Not Met
	5.1	The unit regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.		
	5.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.		
	5.3	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.		

SUMMARY EVALUATION	Yes	No
The program meets or exceeds the minimum standards of good practice.		

*Criterion included in the performance funding calculation.

Appendix III • Checklist for 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 *"Program Review Summary Sheet for Graduate Programs."* The Summary Sheet consists of 20 criteria grouped into four categories. THEC will use the criteria to assess standards for graduate programs. All criteria noted with an asterisk are excluded from the performance funding point calculation

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 summary sheet 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 summary sheet 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 Program Review Summary Sheet will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

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

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

_____

Name

_____

Title

_____

Institution

_____

Signature   **Date**

_____

Name

_____

Title

_____

Institution

_____

Signature   **Dat**

Program Review Summary Sheet for Graduate Programs

Institution:
Program Title(s):
Degree Designation(s) and CIP Code:

A. Student Experience	N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
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. Graduate Faculty Quality	N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
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.					

C. Teaching/Learning Environment	N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
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.					

D.	Program Evaluation	N/A	Poor	Minimally Acceptable	Good	Excellent
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.					

* Criterion not included in the performance funding calculation.

Appendix IV • Suggested Outline for Review Team Report

There are numerous potential methods to organize a report (for example, by the objectives given for the review, by functional lines of research, extension and teaching, or by related groups of programmatic and administrative/managerial issues, or by a combination thereof). Framing a report is based on developing consensus and, therefore, is a continuously evolving commentary that will likely be modified and tailored as the review presentations and dialogue progress. Review teams are not expected to offer comments on every subgroup or every program component. The final report should address the original review objectives and questions raised by the unit administrator or the UTIA Administrative Team.

Generally, each member of the team will have responsibility for giving special attention to specific areas/issues. Individuals may also be assigned a responsibility to lead the team's analysis of a section within the review and in preparing that component of the write-up for the final report. These responsibilities are coordinated through the chair of the review team.

The team must have time sequestered for work sessions to plan, discuss, digest and analyze the information it has received to build consensus on findings, identify conclusions and formulate recommendations. It is suggested that each day, time be set aside for closed sessions, as well as brief time at the end of major components of the review. Open give-and-take by all team members during the deliberations is essential to come to a consensus. If consensus cannot be reached on significant points, a minority view may be identified but should be avoided if at all possible.

Information from the draft report is presented orally to the administration and faculty at the respective closing sessions. Two models for reporting orally may be utilized. First, a single individual, generally the team chair, presents the final report, with additions, as necessary and appropriate, by other team members. Second, individual team members present information based on their area of expertise.

A review report should be concise and focused. References to specific individuals should not be included in the report. Although each Review Team should feel free to modify this proposed outline, it is essential that the final team report have the following components:

1. Title of the review, date of review, and list of review team members.
2. Purpose and objectives of the review
3. One page executive summary with an overall assessment of the program
4. Program strengths, including any uniqueness and significant areas that might be identified.

5. Program weaknesses

6. Recommendations for improvements: state the recommendations (in bold type) and provide a basis for the recommendation(s) [Situation/problem/issue; analysis (strengths/weaknesses); and logic for the recommendation(s)]. Recommendations must be clearly stated and useful in an action mode.

7. Comments

- Is this program making effective use of its resources?
- Explain what qualities this program has or should have to be recognized as a program of national prominence.

Appendix V • Summary of Responsibilities for Full-Cycle Unit Reviews

Unit

❑ Prepares and submits to Coordinator a prioritized list of proposed external and internal reviewers.

❑ Prepares and submits to Coordinator the appropriate number of copies (electronic or paper) of the self-study document.

❑ Prepares and submits tentative review schedule to Review Coordinator.

❑ Schedules participation by unit faculty, staff, and students.

❑ Schedules all rooms for all review sessions.

❑ Arranges all travel, hotel accommodations, breaks meal functions, and ground transportation.

❑ Submits response to the Coordinator within one month after receiving the review team report.

❑ Prepares summary document for review by the Coordinator.

UTIA Administrative Team

❑ Supplements and approves the unit's list of external and internal reviewers.

❑ Pays for all review expenses (e.g., travel, lodging, meal functions, and external reviewers' honoraria).

❑ Chancellor chairs follow-up meeting(s) after review visit.

Review Team

❑ Prepares for the visit by reviewing the documents provided.

❑ Presents preliminary observations and recommendations to unit, UTIA administration and appropriate representatives of UTK administration at Concluding Session.

❑ External reviewers complete Graduate and Undergraduate Checklists at the Concluding Session, returning these to the Coordinator.

❑ Submits a report to the Review Coordinator within three to four weeks after the review visit.

Coordinator

❑ Establishes review date with the unit administrator.

❑ Conducts preliminary planning meeting.

❑ Contacts external and internal reviewers.

❑ Sends confirming letters to reviewers.

❑ Transmits program review guidelines and university catalogs to reviewers.

❑ Contacts UTIA and UTK administration regarding review participation.

❑ Transmits self-study document to reviewers and others.

❑ Confirms and distributes final schedule to review team and participants.

❑ Chairs orientation meeting, UTIA and UTK administration meeting, and concluding session.

❑ Distributes review team's report after review visit.

❑ Collects and distributes to Institutional Research the graduate and undergraduate program checklists after review.

❑ Initiates follow-up meeting(s) after review.

Appendix VI • Summary of Responsibilities for Mid-Cycle Reviews

Unit

❑ Prepares and submits to Coordinator the appropriate number of copies (electronic or paper) of the update document.

❑ Prepares and submits tentative review schedule to Coordinator.

❑ Schedules participation by unit faculty, staff and students.

❑ Schedules all rooms for all review sessions.

❑ Arranges for all meal functions, breaks, travel, hotel accommodations, and ground transportation.

UTIA Administrative Team

❑ Pays all review expenses (e.g., travel, hotel, meal functions, and external reviewers honoraria)

❑ Conducts follow-up activity after receipt of mid-cycle review report.

Review Team

❑ Prepares for the visit by reviewing the documents provided.

❑ Presents preliminary observations and recommendations to unit, UTIA administration and appropriate representatives of UTK administration at concluding sessions.

❑ External reviewers complete Graduate and Undergraduate Checklists at the Concluding Session, returning these to the Coordinator.

❑ Submits the mid-cycle review report to the Coordinator within three to four weeks after the review visit.

Coordinator

❑ Conducts preliminary planning meeting.

❑ Contacts external and internal reviewer.

❑ Sends confirming letters to reviewers.

❑ Transmits original review reports, unit response, mid-cycle review program guidelines, unit update report, and summary document to reviewers.

❑ Contacts UTIA and UTK administration regarding review participation.

❑ Confirms and distributes final schedule and unit report to review team and participants.

❑ Collects and distributes to Institutional Research the graduate and undergraduate program checklists after review.

❑ Chairs orientation meeting and concluding sessions. Distributes mid-cycle review

report after review visit.

Appendix VII • Full-Cycle Unit Review Model Schedule

Elements of the Review Schedule

The review schedule accommodates various presentations and sessions that provide for dialog regarding the programs of the unit. Units are encouraged to focus on broad program areas rather than on individual or specific projects. The amount of time needed to view facilities and equipment varies, depending on the objectives of the review. Normally, office space, laboratories, and classrooms are not visited, unless these areas are uniquely designed for the specific unit. Facilities and equipment critical to implementation of the broader unit plan and operation should be considered priority for the review process.

All sessions should allocate at least 50% of the time for dialog. Formal presentations about different aspects of the unit should be kept to a minimum.

Time for sequestered review team meetings is critical for effective unit review. Critical times include 1) time at the beginning for the team to get organized and discuss general aspects of the review, 2) each evening, the review team should be given time to process the information and findings from the day, and 3) significant time the morning of the last day to pull together the draft report and presentations made to the unit and UTIA Administrative Team and UTK administrators (if appropriate).

Each review should provide for an opening orientation of the review team with the Coordinator and the UTIA Administrative Team and two closing sessions with 1) the unit faculty and staff, and 2) the UTIA Administrative Team and UTK administrators (if appropriate).

Model Schedule for a Unit Review

Department name		
Review date		
External reviewers		
	Name	Institution
	Name	Institution
	Name	Institution
Internal reviewers	Name	Department
	Name	Department
	Name	Department

Sunday, Date

Unit arranges ground transportation for external reviewers from the airport

Monday, Date   NOTE: department arranges transportation for all scheduled meetings

8:30 a.m.   Pick up external reviewers at the hotel

8:45 a.m.   Orientation Meeting, (List location)

        Review Team

        Unit Administrator (List name)

        UTIA Administrative Team members (List names)

        Coordinator (List name)

9:15 a.m.   Team organizational meeting

        Review Team

9:30 a.m.   Tour and Overview of the Department

        Review Team

        Unit Administrator (List name)

10:45 a.m.   Program highlights presentation and discussion, (List location)

        Review Team

Unit Faculty and/or Professional/Clerical/Technical Staff

12:00 noon   Lunch, (List location)

(*Arranged and paid by the unit; if held off-campus, internal reviewer given signatory authority to direct bill to unit*)

    Review Team

1:30 p.m.   Undergraduate Program Overview, (List location); if non-degree granting unit, Programs Overview

    Review Team

    Unit Administrator (List name)

    Unit faculty and/or professional staff

    College Director of Advising (for degree-granting units) (List name)

2:15 p.m.   Interviews with Undergraduate Students, (List location)

Non-degree granting units – Interviews with collaborating faculty and professional staff

    Review Team

    Undergraduate students in individual or group meetings or collaborating faculty and professional staff

3:00 p.m.   Break

3:15 p.m.   Graduate Program Overview, (List location)

Non-degree granting units – Interviews with collaborating faculty and professional staff

    Review Team

    Unit Administrator (List name)

    College Graduate Dean (List name), if degree-granting unit

    Dean of the Graduate School, if degree-granting unit

    Unit Faculty or collaborating faculty and professional staff

4:00 p.m.   Interviews with Graduate Students, (List location), if degree granting unit

                Work Session, (List location), for non-degree granting units

                Review Team

                Graduate students in individual or group meetings

4:45 p.m.   Work Session, (List location)

                Review Team

6:30 p.m.   Dinner, (List location)

                Review Team

(*Arranged and paid by the unit; if held off-campus, internal reviewer given signatory authority to direct bill to unit*)

Tuesday, Date

8:10 a.m.   Pick up external reviewers at the hotel

8:30 a.m.   Program highlights presentation and discussion, (List location)

                Review Team

                Unit Faculty and/or Professional/Clerical/Technical Staff

9:30 a.m.   Break

9:45 a.m.   UTIA Administrative Team Meeting, (List location)

                Review Team

                UTIA Administrative Team and other administrators, as appropriate for the unit under review

10:45 a.m.   Break

11:00 a.m.   Program highlights presentation and discussion, (List location)

                Review Team

                Unit faculty and/or professional/clerical/technical staff

12:00 noon   Lunch with unit administrators of related departments/units, (List location)

                (*Arranged and paid by the unit; if held off-campus, internal reviewer given*

signatory authority to direct bill to unit)

>Review Team

>Unit administrators of related departments or units

1:30 p.m.   Tour of Facilities and Equipment or Faculty and/or Professional/Clerical/ Technical Staff Interviews, as needed, (List location)

>Review Team

>Individual or group meetings, as appropriate

3:00 p.m.   Break

3:15 p.m.   Unit Administrator Exit Interview, (List location)

>Review Team

>Unit Administrator

5:00 p.m.   Work Session, (List location)

>Review Team

6:30 p.m.   Dinner, (List location)

(*Arranged and paid for by unit; internal reviewer given signatory authority for direct bill to unit*)

>Review Team (only)

Wednesday, Date

8:10 a.m.   Pick up external reviewers at the hotel

8:30 a.m.   Work Session, (List location)

11:00 a.m.   Concluding Session with Unit, (List location)

>Review Team

>Unit Faculty, Professional/Clerical/Technical Staff

12:00 noon   Concluding Session over Lunch with UTIA Administrative Team

>Review Team

>UTIA Administrative Team (List names)

Other UTK Administrators, as appropriate (List names)

Coordinator

Department arranges transportation to the airport for the external reviewers.

References: (Please include on the schedule)

Unit Administrator (List name, title, address, phone number, and email)

Appropriate Deans (List names, titles, address, phone number, and email)

Coordinator (List name, title, address, phone number, and email)

Note: Some units list the external reviewers' arrival and departure information on the schedule.

Appendix VIII • Mid-Cycle Review Model Schedule

Elements of the Review Schedule

The review schedule accommodates various presentations and sessions that provide for dialog regarding the programs of the unit. Units are encouraged to focus on broad program areas rather than on individual or specific projects. Tours of facilities and equipment critical to implementation of the broader unit plan and operation should be considered only if there were significant changes since the full program review.

All sessions should allocate at least 50% of the time for dialog. Formal presentations about different aspects of the unit should be kept to a minimum.

Time for sequestered review team meetings is critical for effective unit review. Critical times include 1) time at the beginning for the team to get organized and discuss general aspects of the review, 2) each evening, the review team should be given time to process the information and findings from the day, and 3) significant time the morning of the last day to pull together the draft report and presentations made to the unit and UTIA Administrative Team and UTK administrators (if appropriate).

Each review should provide for an opening orientation of the review team with the Coordinator and the UTIA Administrative Team and two closing sessions with 1) the unit faculty and staff, and 2) the UTIA Administrative Team and UTK administrators (if appropriate).

Model Schedule for a Mid-Cycle Unit Review

Department name	_____
Review date	_____

External reviewers

_____	_____
Name	Institution
_____	_____
Name	Institution
_____	_____
Name	Institution

Internal reviewers

_____	_____
Name	Department
_____	_____
Name	Department
_____	_____
Name	Department

Sunday, Date

Unit arranges ground transportation for external reviewer from airport

Monday, Date   (NOTE: Department arranges transportation for all scheduled meetings)

8:30 a.m.   Pick up external reviewer at the hotel

8:45 a.m.   Orientation Meeting, (List location)

> Review Team
>
> Unit Administrator (List name)
>
> UTIA Administrative Team members attending (List names)
>
> Coordinator (List name)

9:15 a.m.   Team organizational meeting

9:30 a.m.   Unit Administrator Meeting, (List location)

> Review Team
>
> Unit Administrator (List name)

10:30 a.m.   Program highlights presentation and discussion, (List location)

> Review Team
>
> Unit Faculty and/or Professional/Clerical/Technical Staff

12:00 noon	Lunch, (List location)

Arranged and paid for by department; if held off-campus, internal reviewer given signatory authority to direct bill to unit

> Review Team

1:30 p.m.	UTIA Administrative Team Meeting, (List location)

> Review Team

> UTIA Administrative Team members (List names)

2:45 p.m.	Break

3:00 p.m.	Student Interviews or Faculty/Staff if non-degree granting unit, (List location)

> Review Team

> Unit schedules appropriate group or individuals

4:00 p.m.	Faculty Interviews, (List location)

> Review Team

> Unit schedules appropriate group or individuals

6:30 p.m.	Dinner, (List location)

Department head arranges dinner in conjunction with appropriate dean(s). Unit administrator hosts and pays for dinner.

> Review Team

> Unit administrator (List name)

> UTIA Administrative Team (List names)

Tuesday, Date

9:00 a.m.	Work Session, (List location)

> Review Team

11:00 a.m.	Concluding Session, (List location)

> Review Team

> UTIA Administrative Team (List names)

Other UTK Administrators, as appropriate (List names)

Coordinator (List name)

12:00 noon   Adjourn

Department arranges transportation to the airport for the external reviewer

References: (Please include on the schedule)

Unit Administrator (List name, title, address, phone number, and email)

UTIA Administrative Team (List names, titles, addresses, phone numbers, and emails)

Coordinator (List name, title, address, phone number, and email)

Appendix IX • List of Participating Offices and Administrators

Office or person	Planning	Implementation	Orientation Session	UTIA Admin. Session	Closing session with unit	Closing session with administrators	Receives self-study	Receives check-lists & review team report	Receives depart-ment's response	Attends follow-up meeting	Receives summary document
Coordinator	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Unit administrator	X	X					X	X	X	X	X
Unit faculty, professional/technical/ clerical staff	X	X			X		X	X	X		X
Review Team			X	X	X	X	X		X[1]		X
UTIA Offices											
Chancellor	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
AgResearch OD[2]	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
UT Extension OD	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
CASNR[3] OD	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
CVM[4] OD	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
General Services				X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Marketing & Commun- ications Services				X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Development				X		X	X	X	X	X	X
UTK Offices											
Provost			X[5]			X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
Graduate School						X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
Libraries						X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
VC[6] for Finance & Administration						X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
Facility Services						X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
VC for Student Affairs						X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]
OIRA[7]	X[5]					X[5]	X[5]	X[5]	X[5]		X[5]

(Revised January 2009)

[1] Receives the unit's response to the program review and summary document in preparation of the mid-cycle review
[2] OD = Office of the Dean
[3] CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
[4] CVM = College of Veterinary Medicine
[5] Invited if unit under review offers academic degrees
[6] VC = Vice Chancellor
[7] Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Appendix X • Schedule of Full-Cycle, Mid-Cycle, Department Head, and Accreditation Reviews

Dept.[1]	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
Agric. Econ.								Oct-08					Oct-13	HRV due10/13				Oct-18					Oct-23			
Agric. Leadership, Educ. & Comm.							NCATE			Nov-10		NCATE Fall 13		Nov-14					Nov-19					Nov-24		
Animal Science					Sep-05			Sep-08				HRV due 07/3		Apr-20					Sep-19						Sep-25	
Bios. Engr & Soil Sci.			Oct-03				Sep-07					ABET due 09/12	Oct-13	HRV due 08/13				Oct-18					Oct-23			
Ento. & Plant Path.	Oct-01				Oct-05						Oct-11	HRV due 07/13				Oct-16					Oct-21					Oct-26
Food Sci. & Tech.			Apr-04							Apr-11		HRV due 01/13			Apr-16					Apr-21					Apr-26	

[1] Full-cycle review=yellow, mid-cycle review=light blue, department head review=pink, CVM administrative unit review=light orange and accreditation review=light green

Dept.[1]	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
Forestry, Wildlife, & Fisheries	Nov-01				Sep-05	SAF					HRV due 05/12	Oct-12				Oct-16	SAF					Oct-22				
Plant Sciences				Sep-04						Sep-10			HRV due 01/14		Sep-14					Sep-14					Sep-22	
Veterinary Medicine[1]								AVMA						AVMA												
Comp. & Exp. Medicine		Oct 02			Jan-09					Admin		Oct-12		Admin			Oct-17					Oct-22				

---

[1] The AVMA accreditation review is accepted as the THEC Academic Program review.