

REVISED DRAFT
APRIL 1980

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLES AND STANDARDS

1981-82

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>
I. PROGRAM ACCREDITATION	20
II. GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES	20
III. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES	20
IV. PROGRAM/SERVICES SATISFACTION INDICES	20
V. EVALUATION PLANNING/ACTION FOR RENEWAL AND IMPROVEMENT	20

TABLE 5.5

I

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE - REVISEDPROGRAM ACCREDITATIONPerformance StandardPoints Awarded

An institution will be awarded points on this variable based on the percentage of eligible programs accredited. For example, an institution having 30% of its eligible programs accredited would be awarded 6 points. An institution having 50% accredited would be awarded 10 points.

0 - 20

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) A "program" is defined as a sequence of courses and/or other educational experiences leading to a degree major as carried in the THEC program inventory.
- (2) A program is defined as "eligible" if there is a COPA approved agency or organization which accredits programs for that field and degree level.
- (3) Program fields covered by an umbrella accreditation will be counted as "one" unit. For example, if an institution offers five bachelor's degree majors in business, and the business school or college is AACSB accredited at the undergraduate level, these five programs will be counted as one program for purposes of this variable.
- (4) Programs automatically excluded from the list of eligible programs are programs (a) that have been approved by THEC for less than five years, (b) that are being terminated or phased out--based on official action of the appropriate governing board and formal notification to the Commission of such action, and (c) that have been officially identified by the respective governing boards as "inactive" and formal notification furnished to the Commission for its inventory records.
- (5) A program eligible for accreditation by more than one agency will be counted only once in the "eligible" list.
- (6) THEC staff will prepare a list of eligible programs from program inventory records. This list will serve as the official list of eligible programs unless institutions request and THEC formally approves the exemption of a program. Such THEC action of exception must take place at least one meeting prior to the meeting each year in which the appropriations recommendations are adopted by the THEC.

II

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

II

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES

<u>Performance Standards</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
(1) The institution has assessed the performance of a representative sampling of graduates for its major degree--associate or bachelor's--on a measure of general education outcomes at least once during the past four years.	5
(2) The institution has, during the last four years, assessed the general education performance of a representative sampling of a majority of its graduates by major field or college, and has begun a program of inter-field or inter-collegiate analyses of the data.	10
(3) The institution has an ongoing program to assess the performance of its graduates on a measure of general education outcomes and has available data, preferably on the same measure, for representative samples of two or more classes of graduates during the previous four years.	15
(4) The institution meets the requirement of standard (3) and can further demonstrate for the most recent or one of the two most recent assessments that the development of its graduates--that is, the change in performance from freshman to graduation--is equivalent to or greater than the development of students from at least one institution whose freshmen performance is at a comparable level.	20

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) "General Education Outcomes" are generally defined as that knowledge and those skills expected of graduates earning the major degree of an institution. These may include communication, problem solving ability, reasoning skill, analytic and synthesis skills, familiarity with major modes of inquiry, etc. The specific definition of these outcomes is expected to reflect the mission, philosophy, and special character of each institution.

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

- (2) The "measure of outcome" must be an assessment instrument having norms beyond the institution. Examples would include the ACT, COMP battery, the ETS GRE Aptitude tests, and ETS Undergraduate Assessment Program, the Adult Proficiency Level Examination, elements of the National Assessment of Education Progress. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.
- (3) A "representative sampling" is defined as a sample of graduates chosen so that the sample statistically represents the population of graduates. The population of graduates is presumed to include all those receiving the institution's major degree for a given year.
- (4) An "ongoing program" of general education assessment is defined as a program described in formal institution policy and published in appropriate academic policy documents.
- (5) Information supplied in support of performance on this variable and its standards should include:
 - (a) A brief description of the instrument employed and the agency or company publishing the instrument. The general education outcomes assessed by the instrument should be concisely described.
 - (b) The dates of administration.
 - (c) A description of the population or sample assessed--including size of the sample and other evidence of how the sample was chosen to represent the population.
 - (d) A concise presentation and analysis of results for each administration.
 - (e) An analysis of those institutions and/or referent student populations judged to be comparable for those institutions attempting to qualify on standard (3). The analysis should include the data basis for concluding that the institution's graduates developed at a rate equivalent to or greater than students from comparable institutions.
 - (f) A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY OR PRACTICE CHANGES MADE AS A RESULT OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THE GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT AFTER TWO YEARS' DATA HAVE BEEN COLLECTED.

III

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

III

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Performance Standards

Points Awarded

- (1) Within the past five years, the institution has assessed the performance of a representative sampling of graduates in program fields leading to its major degree--associate or bachelor's. Points shall be awarded on the percentage of eligible fields. For example, an institution having assessed 50% of its eligible fields would be awarded 5 points. 0 - 10
- (2) The institution can meet the requirement of standard (1) and has an ongoing program to assess the performance of its graduates in a majority of its major program fields. For each program field reported in standard (1), the institution has data available, preferably on the same measure, for a representative sampling of two or more classes of graduates within the past five years. 15
- (3) The institution meets the requirements of standard (2) and can further demonstrate that the performance of its graduates in the majority of those program fields assessed is above the performance of graduates from the same field in comparable institutions. 20

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) A "program field" is defined as a sequence of courses and/or other educational experiences leading to a degree major as carried in the THEC program inventory.
- (2) "Performance" is defined as the scores of students on an assessment instrument/procedure constructed external to the institution and having normative standards for state, regional, or national referent groups. Examples would include the GRE field tests, state or national licensing examinations, professional field tests such as National Teacher Examination, Engineer in Training Examination, etc.
- (3) An "eligible" field is one in which there is an assessment instrument available and which field is carried in the THEC Academic Inventory. For purposes of this variable, "eligible" fields may be clustered for related majors. For example, program majors in Accounting, Management, Marketing, etc., may be counted as one "eligible" program if they are assessed by a common instrument.

III
TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

- (4) An "ongoing program" to assess the performance of graduates in major program fields is defined as a program described in formal institutional policy and published in appropriate academic policy documents.
- (5) A "representative sampling" of graduates is one chosen so that it statistically represents the population of graduates in a particular program field/major.
- (6) A "comparable" institution is one whose entering freshmen performance aptitudes are similar.
- (7) The following material should be supplied for each eligible program major.
 - (a) The program or professional field assessed.
 - (b) A brief description of the instrument employed, including the firm or agency publishing the instrument.
 - (c) The date(s) of administration during the past five years (from September 1, 1975 through summer 1980).
 - (d) A brief presentation and analysis of results.
 - (e) If comparisons with comparable institutions are used to qualify on standard (3), the analysis should include the data basis for concluding that performance is equivalent to or greater than comparable institutions.
 - (f) A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY OR PRACTICE CHANGES MADE AS A RESULT OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THESE ASSESSMENTS AFTER TWO YEARS' DATA HAVE BEEN COLLECTED.

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

IV

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

PROGRAMS/SERVICES SATISFACTION

INDICES

Performance Standards

Points Awarded

During the past four years (1976-77, 77-78, 78-79, 79-80), an institution has conducted evaluative surveys of instructional programs/services for a representative sampling of currently enrolled students, recent alumni, or community members/employers.

- | | | |
|-----|--|----|
| (1) | Institution has surveyed <u>at least one</u> of the three referent groups with application to the majority of its program fields or to the entire institution. | 10 |
| (2) | Institution has surveyed two or more of the referent groups with application to the majority of its program fields or to the entire institution | |

or

20

Institution has evaluation/satisfaction data available from two or more surveys of the same referent group utilizing the same survey instrument--with application to majority of program fields or entire institution. That is, the institution has an ongoing assessment of its programs/services with a recurring or periodic survey of the same referent group and can present comparable evaluation data from at least two such surveys within the past four years.

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) An "evaluative survey" is defined as one yielding quantifiable indices reflecting satisfaction or evaluation of instructional programs or services. The survey instrument may be a nationally or locally constructed instrument. Examples would be the NCHEMS Program Completer questionnaires, the ETS Student Reaction to College, the UCLA College Student Experiences Questionnaire, ACT Evaluation/Survey Services.
- (2) A "program field" means a sequence of courses and/or educational experiences leading to a degree major as carried in the THEC program inventory. For purposes of this variable, a program field may also designate a cluster of related majors--such as programs in business, allied health, education, engineering, humanities, etc.

IV

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

- (3) "Application to majority of program fields" is intended to describe a survey which applies to more than half of individual majors or academic units. If an institution offers 60 majors in five academic units, a "majority of program fields" would mean surveys applying to 31 or more of the majors, or surveys conducted by at least three of the five academic units.
- (4) A representative sampling means a sample so chosen that it statistically represents the population. The response rate is expected to approximate that of other similar surveys, to approach 50% or greater.
- (5) Data to be provided in support of this variable should include the following:
 - (a) A brief description of the survey instrument employed. The description should indicate the company or firm publishing the instrument (if a local instrument was not employed) and concisely outline which program, service, or policy factors were evaluated. A copy of the survey may be included--and must be included if an institutionally constructed instrument was employed.
 - (b) The date(s) of administration during 1976-77, 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 years.
 - (c) A description of population or sample surveyed and response rate, and (if appropriate) methods used to check non-response bias.
 - (d) A brief presentation and analysis of results.
 - (e) A DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC POLICY OR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THE SURVEY.

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLEEVALUATION PLANNING FOR RENEWAL AND IMPROVEMENTPerformance VariablePoints Awarded

This variable encourages the development of a comprehensive institutional evaluation plan centering on instructional improvement. It also recognizes that institutions will have designed and implemented some evaluation activities which make major contributions to instructional renewal and improvement but these activities may not be adequately reflected in any previous four variables. Institutions may submit activities that . . .

0 - 20

- (1) Have been designed and implemented within the past four years.
- (2) Have yielded at least one set of evaluation results. Activities planned but not yielding results are not eligible.
- (3) Have direct impact on the effectiveness of educational programs, services (advising, etc.), or faculty/administrative performance.

Evaluation accomplishments submitted on this variable will be reviewed against these criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the activity is part of a comprehensive institutional evaluation plan.
- (2) The extent to which the activity complements rather than duplicates evaluation activities of the first four variables.
- (3) The extent to which the activity involves the endorsement and participation of institutional faculty.
- (4) The extent to which the activity accents the mission of the institution.
- (5) The extent to which the activity supports goals-objectives of its governing board and those of the THEC 1979 Master Plan.

- K
- (6) The extent to which the activity involves the application of or reference to judgments and/or performance standards external to the institution.
 - (7) The extent to which the activity reflects the application of imaginative or new ideas/approaches to evaluation.
 - (8) The extent to which the activity directly affects instructional policy or practice.
 - (9) The extent to which the activity appears to have recognition beyond the institution.
 - (10) The extent to which results and analysis are reported in specific and clear style.

II

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

II

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES

Performance Standards

Points Awarded

- | | |
|--|----|
| (1) The institution has assessed the performance of a representative sampling of graduates for its major degree--associate or bachelor's--on a measure of general education outcomes at least once during the past four years. | 5 |
| (2) The institution has, during the last four years, assessed the general education performance of a representative sampling of a majority of its graduates by major field or college, and has begun a program of inter-field or inter-collegiate analyses of the data. | 10 |
| (3) The institution has an ongoing program to assess the performance of its graduates on a measure of general education outcomes and has available data, preferably on the same measure, for representative samples of two or more classes of graduates during the previous four years. | 15 |
| (4) The institution meets the requirement of standard (3) and can further demonstrate for the most recent or one of the two most recent assessments that the development of its graduates--that is, the change in performance from freshman to graduation--is equivalent to or greater than the development of students from at least one institution whose freshmen performance is at a comparable level. | 20 |

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) "General Education Outcomes" are generally defined as that knowledge and those skills expected of graduates earning the major degree of an institution. These may include communication, problem solving ability, reasoning skill, analytic and synthesis skills, familiarity with major modes of inquiry, etc. The specific definition of these outcomes is expected to reflect the mission, philosophy, and special character of each institution.

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

- (2) The "measure of outcome" must be an assessment instrument having norms beyond the institution. Examples would include the ACT, COMP battery, the ETS GRE Aptitude tests, and ETS Undergraduate Assessment Program, the Adult Proficiency Level Examination, elements of the National Assessment of Education Progress. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.
- (3) A "representative sampling" is defined as a sample of graduates chosen so that the sample statistically represents the population of graduates. The population of graduates is presumed to include all those receiving the institution's major degree for a given year.
- (4) An "ongoing program" of general education assessment is defined as a program described in formal institution policy and published in appropriate academic policy documents.
- (5) Information supplied in support of performance on this variable and its standards should include:
 - (a) A brief description of the instrument employed and the agency or company publishing the instrument. The general education outcomes assessed by the instrument should be concisely described.
 - (b) The dates of administration.
 - (c) A description of the population or sample assessed--including size of the sample and other evidence of how the sample was chosen to represent the population.
 - (d) A concise presentation and analysis of results for each administration.
 - (e) An analysis of those institutions and/or referent student populations judged to be comparable for those institutions attempting to qualify on standard (3). The analysis should include the data basis for concluding that the institution's graduates developed at a rate equivalent to or greater than students from comparable institutions.
 - (f) A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY OR PRACTICE CHANGES MADE AS A RESULT OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THE GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT AFTER TWO YEARS' DATA HAVE BEEN COLLECTED.

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

IV

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

PROGRAMS/SERVICES SATISFACTION

INDICES

Performance Standards

Points Awarded

During the past four years (1976-77, 77-78, 78-79, 79-80), an institution has conducted evaluative surveys of instructional programs/services for a representative sampling of currently enrolled students, recent alumni, or community members/employers.

- | | |
|--|----|
| (1) Institution has surveyed <u>at least one</u> of the three referent groups with application to the majority of its program fields or to the entire institution. | 10 |
| (2) Institution has surveyed two or more of the referent groups with application to the majority of its program fields or to the entire institution | |

or

20

Institution has evaluation/satisfaction data available from two or more surveys of the same referent group utilizing the same survey instrument--with application to majority of program fields or entire institution. That is, the institution has an ongoing assessment of its programs/services with a recurring or periodic survey of the same referent group and can present comparable evaluation data from at least two such surveys within the past four years.

Definitions, Commentary, Procedures

- (1) An "evaluative survey" is defined as one yielding quantifiable indices reflecting satisfaction or evaluation of instructional programs or services. The survey instrument may be a nationally or locally constructed instrument. Examples would be the NCHEMS Program Completer questionnaires, the ETS Student Reaction to College, the UCLA College Student Experiences Questionnaire, ACT Evaluation/Survey Services.
- (2) A "program field" means a sequence of courses and/or educational experiences leading to a degree major as carried in the THEC program inventory. For purposes of this variable, a program field may also designate a cluster of related majors--such as programs in business, allied health, education, engineering, humanities, etc.

IV

TABLE 5.5 (Cont.)

- (3) "Application to majority of program fields" is intended to describe a survey which applies to more than half of individual majors or academic units. If an institution offers 60 majors in five academic units, a "majority of program fields" would mean surveys applying to 31 or more of the majors, or surveys conducted by at least three of the five academic units.
- (4) A representative sampling means a sample so chosen that it statistically represents the population. The response rate is expected to approximate that of other similar surveys, to approach 50% or greater.
- (5) Data to be provided in support of this variable should include the following:
 - (a) A brief description of the survey instrument employed. The description should indicate the company or firm publishing the instrument (if a local instrument was not employed) and concisely outline which program, service, or policy factors were evaluated. A copy of the survey may be included--and must be included if an institutionally constructed instrument was employed.
 - (b) The date(s) of administration during 1976-77, 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 years.
 - (c) A description of population or sample surveyed and response rate, and (if appropriate) methods used to check non-response bias.
 - (d) A brief presentation and analysis of results.
 - (e) A DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC POLICY OR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THE SURVEY.

V

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION VARIABLE

EVALUATION PLANNING FOR RENEWAL AND IMPROVEMENT

Performance Variable

Points Awarded

This variable encourages the development of a comprehensive institutional evaluation plan centering on instructional improvement. It also recognizes that institutions will have designed and implemented some evaluation activities which make major contributions to instructional renewal and improvement but these activities may not be adequately reflected in any previous four variables. Institutions may submit activities that . . .

0 - 20

- (1) Have been designed and implemented within the past four years.
- (2) Have yielded at least one set of evaluation results. Activities planned but not yielding results are not eligible.
- (3) Have direct impact on the effectiveness of educational programs, services (advising, etc.), or faculty/administrative performance.

Evaluation accomplishments submitted on this variable will be reviewed against these criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the activity is part of a comprehensive institutional evaluation plan.
- (2) The extent to which the activity complements rather than duplicates evaluation activities of the first four variables.
- (3) The extent to which the activity involves the endorsement and participation of institutional faculty.
- (4) The extent to which the activity accents the mission of the institution.
- (5) The extent to which the activity supports goals-objectives of its governing board and those of the THEC 1979 Master Plan.

- FV
- (6) The extent to which the activity involves the application of or reference to judgments and/or performance standards external to the institution.
 - (7) The extent to which the activity reflects the application of imaginative or new ideas/approaches to evaluation.
 - (8) The extent to which the activity directly affects instructional policy or practice.
 - (9) The extent to which the activity appears to have recognition beyond the institution.
 - (10) The extent to which results and analysis are reported in specific and clear style.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Institution	I Program Accreditation	II General Education Outcomes	III Program Performance	IV Programs/ Services Satisfaction Indices	V Evaluation Planning for Renewal and Improvement	Total
Austin Peay State University						
East Tennessee State University						
Memphis State University						
Middle Tennessee State University						
Tennessee State University						
Tennessee Tech. University						
University of Tenn. at Chattanooga						
University of Tenn. at Knoxville						
University of Tenn. at Martin						
Chatt. State Tech. Community College						
Cleveland State Community College						
Columbia State Community College						
Dyersburg State Community College						
Jackson State Community College						
Motlow State Community College						
Roane State Community College						
Shelby State Community College						
Volunteer State Community College						
Walters State Community College						
Nashville State Technical Institute						
State Tech. Inst. at Memphis						
State Tech. Inst. at Knoxville						
Tri-Cities State Technical Institute						