THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE CHATTANOOGA

Academic Program Review

Reviewer Rubric

(Graduate Programs)

Prepared by the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research (OPEIR)

Reviewer Rubric

2020-25 Quality Assurance Funding
Program Review: Graduate Programs

Institution: The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	
Program Title: Computer Science	
CIP Code: 06.11.0701.00	**Degree Designation:** Master of Science

Instruction for External Reviewer(s)

In accordance with the 2020-25 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 program appear in the following *Program Review Rubric*. The *Program Review Rubric* lists 32 criteria grouped into six categories. THEC will use these criteria to assess standards and distribute points in to graduate programs. The four 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 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 the program currently exhibits poor, fair, good or excellent in meeting the criterion. If a particular criterion is 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 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 entire program review committee, the *Program Review 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 university's budget.

Name, Title and Institutional Affiliation of Reviewer(s)

Name	Yong Pei	**Name**	
Title	Professor and Chair, Department of Computer Science	**Title**	
Institution	Kennesaw State University	**Institution**	
Signature	Yong Pei Digitally signed by Yong Pei Date: 2023.03.31 12:50:04 -04'00'	**Signature**	
Date	03/31/2023	**Date**	

Program Review Rubric
Graduate Programs

Directions: Please rate the quality of the academic program by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box to indicate whether the program currently exhibits poor, fair, good or excellent evidence of meeting the criterion.

1. Learning Outcomes		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1.1	Program and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.					X
1.2	The program uses appropriate evidence to evaluate achievement of program and student learning outcomes.					X
1.3	The program makes use of information from its evaluation of program and student learning outcomes and uses the results for continuous improvement.					X
1.4	The program directly aligns with the institution's mission.					X
2. Curriculum		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
2.1	The curriculum content and organization is reviewed regularly and the results are used for curricular improvement.					X
2.2	The program has developed a process to ensure courses are offered regularly and that students can make timely progress towards their degree.				X	
2.3	The program reflects progressively more advanced in academic content than its related undergraduate programs.					X
2.4	The curriculum is aligned with and contributes to mastery of program and student learning outcomes identified in 1.1.					X
2.5	The curriculum is structured to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline.					X
2.6	The curriculum strives to offer ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.					X
2.7	Programs offered entirely through distance education technologies are evaluated regularly to assure achievement of program outcomes at least equivalent to on-campus programs.					X
2.8	The program incorporates appropriate pedagogical and/or technological innovations that advance student learning into the curriculum.					X

3. Student Experience		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
3.1	The program ensures a critical mass of students to ensure an appropriate group of peers.					X
3.2	The program provides students with the opportunities to regularly evaluate the curriculum and faculty relative to the quality of their teaching effectiveness.					X
3.3	The program provides adequate professional development opportunities, such as encouraging membership in professional associations, participation in conferences and workshops, and opportunities for publication.					X
3.4	The program provides adequate enrichment opportunities, such as lecture series, to promote a scholarly environment.					X
3.5	The program seeks to include diverse perspectives and experiences through curricular and extracurricular activities.					X
3.6	Students have access to appropriate academic support services.					X
4. Faculty		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
4.1	All faculty, full time and part-time, meet the high standards set by the program and expected SACSCOC guidelines for credentials.					X
4.2	The faculty teaching loads are aligned with the highly individualized nature of graduate instruction, especially the direction of theses or dissertations.					X
4.3*	The faculty strives to cultivate diversity with respect to gender, ethnicity, and academic background, as appropriate to the demographics of the discipline.					X
4.4	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship and practice.					X
4.5	The faculty is actively engaged in planning, evaluation and improvement processes that measure and advance student success.					X
4.6	The program uses an appropriate process to incorporate the faculty evaluation system to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					X

5. Learning Resources		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
5.1*	The program regularly evaluates its equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall institutional resources.					X
5.2	The program has access to learning and information resources that are appropriate to support teaching and learning.					X
5.3	The program provides adequate materials and support staff to encourage research and publication.					X
6. Support		**N/A**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
6.1*	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.				X	
6.2*	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.					X
6.3	The program is responsive to local, state, regional, and national needs.					X
6.4	The program regularly and systematically collects data on graduating students and evaluates placement of graduates.					X
6.5	The program's procedures are regularly reviewed to ensure alignment to institutional policies and mission.					X

**Criteria not scored as part of Quality Assurance Funding.*