2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding
Academic Audit: Graduate Programs

Institution:	
Program Title:	
CIP Code:	
Academic Audit Status:	_____ **First Academic Audit** _____ **Follow-up Academic Audit**

Instruction for Academic Audit Team

In accordance with the 2015-20 Quality Assurance Program Funding guidelines of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), each non-accreditable graduate program undergoes either an academic audit or external peer review according to a pre-approved review cycle.

The criteria used to evaluate a graduate program appear in the following *Academic Audit Rubric*. The *Academic Audit Rubric* lists 38 criteria grouped into eight standards. Criteria in standards 1-7 will be used to assess standards and distribute points to graduate programs utilizing the Academic Audit for the first time. Programs undergoing a follow-up Academic Audit, criteria 8 will also be used to assess standards and distribute points. The three criteria noted with an asterisk are excluded from the point calculation but will be used by the institution in their overall assessment.

For each criterion within a standard, the responsible program has provided evidence in the form of a Self Study. Supporting documents will be available for review as specified in the Self Study. As an Academic Audit Team Leader, you should evaluate this evidence and any other evidence observed during the site visit to determine whether each criterion within a standard has been met. A checkmark should be placed in the appropriate box to indicate whether the criterion is not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed in the program. If a particular criterion is inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked NA.

The rubric will be shared with the department, college and central administration, as well as the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. When combined with the written report prepared by the Academic Audit Team, the Academic Audit Rubric will facilitate development of a program action plan to ensure continuous quality improvement.

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

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Audit Team Leaders

Name		**Name**	
Title		**Title**	
Institution		**Institution**	
Signature		**Signature**	
Date		**Date**	

Academic Audit Rubric
Graduate Programs

Directions: Please rate the quality of the academic program by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box to indicate whether the criterion is not applicable (N/A), not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed.

1. Learning Outcomes		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
1.1	The faculty has identified program learning outcomes that are current, measurable and based upon appropriate processes and evidence regarding the requirements of the discipline.					
1.2	The faculty has identified student learning outcomes in its core coursework that are clear, measurable and based on an appropriate process to identify what students need to master in each course.					
1.3	The faculty has an appropriate process for evaluating program and course-level learning outcomes on a regular basis taking into account best practices, stakeholder feedback and appropriate benchmarks in the field.					
2. Curriculum		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
2.1	The faculty collaborates regularly and effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.					
2.2	The faculty regularly analyzes the content and sequencing of courses as applicable in terms of achieving program learning outcomes.					
2.3	The faculty regularly reviews the curriculum based on appropriate evidence including comparison with best practices where appropriate.					
3. Teaching and Learning		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
3.1	The faculty regularly and effectively collaborates in designing, developing and delivering teaching methods that improve student learning throughout the program.					
3.2	The faculty promotes the effective use of instructional materials and teaching tools, including technology as appropriate, for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.					
3.3	The program regularly evaluates the effectiveness of teaching methods and the appropriateness of instructional materials.					
3.4	The faculty analyze evaluation results on a regular basis and modify teaching methods to improve student learning.					
3.5	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances its teaching, scholarship and practice.					

3.6	The program monitors student persistence and success in its courses and program and uses that data to inform improvements in the program and to optimize student success.					
3.7	The program's faculty and students actively develop, promote and contribute to a scholarly community that engages a network of peers both from within and outside of the institution.					
3.8	Faculty roles and responsibilities are regularly assessed and appropriately distributed across the department to support student success.					
3.9	The program ensures that all students are adequately oriented, advised, mentored and socialized within the discipline and the larger graduate community.					
4. Student Learning Assessment		**N/A**	**Not Evident**	**Emerging**	**Established**	**Highly Developed**
4.1	The faculty uses indicators of student learning success that are aligned with program and student learning outcomes.					
4.2	The faculty assesses student learning at multiple points throughout the program using a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.					
4.3	The program regularly implements continuous quality improvements based upon the results of its student learning assessments.					
4.4	The program requires a culminating experience that demonstrates mastery of student learning outcomes through appropriate communication and ability to apply knowledge.					
4.5	The program regularly provides students with opportunities to participate in activities and/or seminars specific to the discipline outside of the classroom.					
4.6	Data on current students and follow-up data on graduating students, including placement data, are regularly and systematically collected and utilized for program improvement.					
5. Research Environment		**N/A**	**Not Evident**	**Emerging**	**Established**	**Highly Developed**
5.1	The program demonstrates a commitment to matching or exceeding peer institutions in research activities.					
5.2	The faculty effectively communicates the program's research environment, values, and priorities to current and prospective students and other audiences.					
5.3	The program details departmental processes and procedures that reinforce faculty research activities and program competitiveness.					
5.4	The program engages graduate students in inquiry and contemporary research in collaboration with the faculty.					

		N/A	Not Evident	Emerging	Established	Highly Developed
5.5	The program strives for sponsored research funding at comparable levels with other departments within the institution and across peer institutions.					
5.6	The program ensures faculty are consistently informed of external funding opportunities as well as the availability of assistance in areas such as proposal writing and project management.					
5.7	The program demonstrates sufficient depth and breadth in research expertise to enable competitiveness in the external funding arena.					
5.8	The program ensures that external research programs both contribute to its educational program, and align with the missions of the department, college, and university.					
6. Support		**N/A**	**Not Evident**	**Emerging**	**Established**	**Highly Developed**
6.1*	The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.					
6.2*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program					
6.3*	The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					
7. Academic Audit Process		**N/A**	**Not Evident**	**Emerging**	**Established**	**Highly Developed**
7.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.					
7.2	The Academic Audit process (Self Study and site visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes.					
7.3	The Academic Audit process resulted in a thorough description of program strengths and program weaknesses as well as a prioritized list of initiatives for improvement.					
7.4	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from appropriate stakeholder groups.					
8. Follow-up of Previous Audit		**N/A**	**Not Evident**	**Emerging**	**Established**	**Highly Developed**
8.1	There is documented evidence that the program has implemented the plans for its initiatives for improvement cited by the faculty in the previous self-study report including any changes to those initiatives for improvement.					
8.2	There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Auditor Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.					

* Criteria not scored as part of Quality Assurance Funding.