

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2006-07 Performance Funding Report
Standard 5.B: Assessment Implementation**

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Provide title of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) or Student Learning Initiative (SLI):

UTK Quality Enhancement Plan: International and Intercultural Awareness Initiative

QEP or SLI?

QEP

STANDARD OVERVIEW

Standard 5B evaluates the maturity and effectiveness of an institution's assessment processes as they relate to one of two types of student learning quality initiatives: (1) an institution-defined Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in response to SACS reaffirmation processes or (2) an alternate student learning initiative (SLI) of comparable weight.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- Make a case that benchmarks have been achieved using assessment protocols in support of a QEP/SLI are mature and effective in an essay not to exceed 10 double-spaced pages
- Address the essay to an audience of peer examiners.
- All claims in the narrative are supported by documented evidence.
- Encourage to use hyperlink to send the reader from the text to supportive data and evidence.
- Provide a "bibliography" of hyperlinked documents, data, evidence cited that follows the essay.
- Submit 6 CD copies of the report (for distribution to the peer readers) which captures all linked documentation

PEER SCORING AND POINT ALLOCATION

Reports will be assigned values based on a holistic evaluation conducted by trained peer readers applying these rubrics:

- 9-10 points - Based on the evidence provided, the institution consistently does all of the following:
- 7-8 points - Based on the evidence provided, the institution consistently does almost all of the following:
- 5-6 points - Based on the evidence provided, the institution does most of the following:
- 4 points - Based on the evidence provided, the institution does some of the following:

- Provides a summary update of the evolution of the QEP or SLI
- Makes a case that the institution has met annual benchmarks
- Provides documentation for this claim by identifying patterns of evidence emerging
- States annual benchmarks for the next year that are readily assessable and their assessment will yield information usable to support maintaining or modifying the planned course of action related to the QEP/SLI

POINTS RECOMMENDED:

6

Institutional Comments (Optional):

Standard_5B_0607.pdf

Scoring Criteria

1. **Provides a summary update of the evolution of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) or Student Learning Initiative (SLI).**
 - Strengths: Summary of the QEP topic is clearly written.
 - Weakness: There is insufficient background on the evolution of the QEP topic and few details on why (and how) it was developed in the performance funding report.
2. **Makes a case that the institution has met annual benchmarks.**
 - Strengths: Considerable information is provided to support implementation particularly in the area of funding support.
 - Weaknesses: No clear student learning benchmarks were established so that it is difficult to determine if progress has been made. The submission contains very little specific data on annual benchmarks. The QEP is also rather vague on measurable outcomes and annual benchmarks (e.g., "Consistently improving student responses to NSSE questions regarding intercultural/international experiences and learning.") The descriptions of goals and targets are often presented in ways which would make it difficult to determine if there are annual benchmarks and whether they have been achieved. Consequently, it is difficult to determine if the QEP activities have contributed to the fulfillment of the desired outcomes.
3. **Provides documentation for this claim by identifying patterns of evidence emerging**
 - Strengths: There is monitoring of curriculum development in individual departments. The creation of new assessment instruments for the coming year was a logical and commendable reaction to the deficiencies identified with last year's piloted instrument. The institution has administered surveys to investigate student perceptions of the QEP and has apparently learned some things from these surveys.
 - Weaknesses: The institution has not identified many specific patterns of evidence that are emerging and how they are being used to improve the plan. The institution does not appear to have identified an appropriate assessment tool to evaluate changes in student learning related to the QEP and this is both hindering progress and efforts to evaluate whether the additional funding is producing meaningful results.
4. **States annual benchmarks for the next year that are readily assessable and their assessment will yield information usable to support maintaining or modifying the planned course of action related to the QEP or SLI.**
 - Strengths: Some benchmarks are readily apparent and easily assessable (increase in funding to \$700,000). Other benchmarks are less clearly defined (e.g., Diversity Council review of plans to hire and retain diverse faculty and staff, use of student surveys to improve communication and student engagement, development of new assessment instruments for this year to assess student learning).