Program Review

Procedure

Introduction

I.   Program review is an ongoing process designed to preserve and improve the quality of academic programs. It
- monitors the current status, progress and effectiveness of programs;
- identifies programmatic strengths and weaknesses;
- pinpoints programmatic needs, trajectories, and priorities;
- identifies emerging professional, regulatory, and disciplinary directions; and
- stimulates reflection, goal setting, and planning.

II.   A degree program is defined by the THECB as "Any grouping of subject matter courses which, when satisfactorily completed by a student, shall entitle the student to a degree from an institution." ("Glossary of Terms," Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Educational Data Center, March 2012, page 25.)

III.   The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) requires that all graduate programs be reviewed on a seven year schedule (*Texas Administrative Code*, § 5.52).

IV.   UT Permian Basin requires that all programs, both graduate and undergraduate, be reviewed (*Handbook of Operating Procedures*, II-43). The currently approved schedule for both graduate and undergraduate program review is shown in Attachment A.

Accredited Programs

V.   A number of programs at UTPB are accredited by specialized disciplinary accrediting agencies.

    a. For accredited programs, the accreditation serves as the university's program review.

    b. The review schedule is determined by the accrediting agency.

    c. The review is conducted using the standards, formats, site visit, and other requirements of the accrediting agency.

    d. **For accredited graduate programs**, whether or not the accreditation site visit and visitors report will serve as the program review for the THECB must be established in consultation with the THECB.

          i.   The seven year schedule for the graduate program reviews is submitted and must be approved by the THECB. The currently approved schedule is shown in Attachment A.

Unaccredited Programs and Accredited Graduate Programs Required to Undergo Program Review by the THECB

VI.   For the purposes of this procedure, an academic program includes the educational programs of a discipline and the associated scholarly and service activities of its faculty.

       In some cases, an academic department may define the boundaries of an academic program. In other cases, two or more disciplines may exist within one department. In such cases, each of the disciplines and their associated degree programs are reviewed separately and may be reviewed on different schedules.

       In those cases in which free standing programs exist inside a department in which the remainder of the programs are accredited, the free standing programs are scheduled for program review every seven years as shown on the Program Review Schedule (e.g., BA in Economics, BS in Industrial Technology and BAAS track in Industrial Technology).

a.   Whenever feasible, disciplines with approved programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are reviewed simultaneously to diminish duplication of effort, but each level is reviewed by a separate reviewer who develops a separate report.

b.   The primary responsibility for overseeing the review process lies with the dean to whom the program undergoing review reports. The dean works with the department chair and/or the area coordinator of the discipline. The program review is the collective responsibility of the faculty in the discipline.

Program Review Process

VII.   Initiation of the Review

a.   Programs are notified of an upcoming review by the office of their dean in February or March of the year preceding the anticipated site visit for the program review. This allows the discipline approximately 10 to 11 months to complete the self-study. The general Program Review Calendar is shown in Attachment B.

b.   The discipline under review is responsible for the nomination of appropriate reviewers. The discipline will send forward to the dean at least three potential reviewers who have been contacted and will serve if selected for each level of the program. **The Provost makes the final selection of all program**

reviewers. The program's dean formally invites the selected reviewers to participate on the program review team.

    i. For baccalaureate programs, appropriate reviewers are senior faculty or preferably an individual who has been a department chair or dean. An appropriate reviewer would also be a scholar from within or external to the state with appropriate subject-matter expertise who is employed by a higher educational institution with programs similar to those of the unit under review or with expertise that will provide a benefit in terms of action planning for the discipline.

    ii. For master's degree programs, appropriate reviewers are senior faculty who may have experience as a dean or chair, with excellent scholarly credentials and appropriate subject matter expertise who are employed by an institution of higher education outside of Texas. Reviewers must be part of a program recognized for excellence in the discipline, and they must affirm that they have no conflict of interest (Attachment C) related to the program under review.

    iii. For programs undergoing accreditation in conjunction with program review, if reviewers from accrediting agencies do not address the THECB criteria for review of graduate programs, additional reviewers must be added to the team or an additional review must be undertaken to address required criteria.

c. The program review team consists of all reviewers who will be conducting reviews within a college at the same time.

VIII. Preparing the Program Review Self-Study

a. If the program is large enough, the chair in single discipline departments or the area coordinator may appoint a review committee.

    i. The Committee develops a plan for engaging in the self-study process and completing the required report by the due date.

    ii. In smaller disciplines, the initial report is often written by the area coordinator or their designee.

    iii. However, the report is drafted, it must be shared within the discipline and there must be discussion about information and future directions of the program prior to the report's completion.

b. The self-study is a succinct and coherent report that adheres to the "Seven-Year External Academic Program Review Guidelines" in Attachment D.

        i.   The program under review is responsible for preparing some of the data from information in their records. Other information is provided by the Library, IRD, the Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

        ii. Information considered will be both quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative information would include information such as number of majors, enrollment, semester credit hour production, and graduation rates. Qualitative information would include such elements as instructional effectiveness, research productivity, service activities, advising, and assessment of student learning outcomes.

  c. Once the self-study is completed, it must be reviewed by the faculty of the discipline prior to submission to the dean in mid-October.

  d. The self-study is reviewed by the dean and the Director of IRPE and feedback is returned to the discipline.

  e. The final self-study should be completed by November 30 and submitted to the office of the dean.

IX.   The date for the external review site visit is established by the dean of the approximately one year prior to actual date of the visit. The office of the dean is responsible for getting the official welcome and the exit conference on the calendars of both the President and the Provost (see the Program Review Timeline in Attachment B).

  a. The final self-study documents, expectations for the site visit report (see External Review Team Visit and Report Guidelines in Attachment E), and any other materials are sent to the reviewers by the office of the dean no later than 6 weeks prior to the actual visit.

  b. The office of the dean establishes the itinerary for the visit, prepares the paperwork for the reviewers' stipend which is paid by the office of the dean, completes and submits all university paperwork necessary for travel and other arrangements.

  c. The office of the dean makes travel arrangements including hotel accommodations for the reviewers and works with the programs being reviewed to ensure that meetings are arranged, rooms are reserved, meal arrangements are completed, and travel to and from the airport and the hotel is arranged.

  d. The dean meets with the members of review team initially to discuss the visit and the expectations for the review.

  e. If there is more than one reviewer, the reviewers decide on one of their number as the chair of the team.

f. The exit conference is conducted with the reviewers, the dean, the Provost, the President (if possible), the area coordinators of the programs under review, the chairs of the departments in which the programs reside, the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness and any other participants invited by the dean.

g. Within 30 days after the visit, the visitors will return a site visit report to the office of the dean.

    i. At a minimum, the report will contain for each program and degree level, an evaluation of the program, an assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for the future direction of the program.

    ii. For programs that are defined as low-producing by the THECB and the UT System Board of Regents, recommendations must focus on directions to improve graduation productivity or other alternatives such as closure.

X. Once the visitor's report is received, the office of the dean will send a copy to the area coordinators of the programs that were reviewed, the chairs of the programs that were reviewed (if applicable), the Office of the Provost and Vice President, and the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

a. The office of the dean will calendar a meeting with the Provost and Vice President to discuss the report and the program's response and action plan which is attended by the area coordinator for each program, the dean, the Provost and the Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness.

b. The program has four weeks to complete a response to the report and an action plan based on the recommendations in consultation with faculty and with the dean. The report, the program's response to the report, and the action plan are submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice President prior to the meeting with the Provost.

c. The meeting will establish an official action plan for the program.

d. Actions in the plan will be integrated into appropriate departmental planning forms each year until completed.

e. Within 180 days of the receipt of the written visitors report, The Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness will submit the following items to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division of the THECB for graduate program reviews:

    i. a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s)

      ii. actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program.

f. The Coordinating Board staff will review the reports submitted and may require additional actions to improve the programs.

Program Review Schedule								
Program	Last Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	Comment
Social Work BSW	2011			2016				CSWE
Accounting MPA	2011		F 2016- Su 2017		F 2023-Su 2024		F 2030-Su 2031	AACSB
Management MBA	2011		F 2016- Su 2017		F 2023-Su 2024		F 2030-Su 2031	AACSB
Accounting BBA	2011			2016		2026		
Finance BBA	2011			2016		2026		
Marketing BBA	2011			2016		2026		
Management BBA	2011			2016		2026		
Biology MS	2005		F 2017-Su 2018		F 2024-Su 2025		F 2031-Su 2032	
Biology BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Chemistry BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Computer Sciences BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Computer Sciences MS (2007)			F 2017-Su 2018		F 2024-Su 2025		F 2031-Su 2032	
Information Systems BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Geology BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Geology MS	2005		F 2017-Su 2018		F 2024-Su 2025		F 2031-Su 2032	
Mathematics BS	2005	2011		2018		2025		
Mathematics MA (1/2011)			F 2017-Su 2018		F 2024-Su 2025		F 2031-Su 2032	
Communication BA	2007	2012		2019		2026		
English BA	2007	2012		2019		2026		
English MA	2007		F 2018-Su 2019		F 2025-Su 2026		F 2032-Su 2033	
History BA	2007	2012		2019		2026		
History MA	2007		F 2018-Su 2019		F 2025-Su 2026		F 2032-Su 2033	
Spanish BA	2007	2012		2019		2026		
Spanish MA	2007		F 2018-Su 2019		F 2025-Su 2026		F 2032-Su 2033	
Economics BA		2012		2019		2024		
Mechanical Engineering BS		2012 ABET		2017?		2022?		
Industrial Technology BS BAAS		2012		2019		2024		
Ed-Bilingual/ESL MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013

Program	Last Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	UTPB External Review	CB Review	Comment
Ed-Educational Leadership MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013
Ed-Special Education MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013
Ed-Counseling MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013
Ed-Professional Education MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013
Ed-Reading MA	2007	2013 NCATE	F 2013-Su 2014		F 2020- Su 2021		F 2027-Su 2028	SBEC; NCATE Sp 2013
Art BA/BFA	2007	2013 NASAD		2018		2023		NASAD
Program	**Last Review**	**UTPB External Review**	**CB Review**	**UTPB External Review**	**CB Review**	**UTPB External Review**	**CB Review**	**Comment**
Criminal Justice BS	2008	2014		2021		2028		
Criminology BA	2008	2014		2021		2028		
Criminal Justice Admin MS	2008		F 2014-Su 2015		F 2021-Su 2022		F 2028-Su 2029	
Leadership Studies BA	2008	2014		2021		2028		
Public Administration MPA	2008*		F 2014-Su 2015		F 2021-Su 2022		F 2028-Su 2029	
Political Science BA	2008	2014		2021		2028		
Kinesiology BS	2008	2015		2022		2029		
Kinesiology MS	2008		F 2015-Su 2016		F 2022-Su 2023		F 2029-Su 2030	
Athletic Training BS		2014						CAATE
Psychology BA	2008	2015		2022		2029		
Psychology MA	2008		F 2015-Su 2016		F 2022-Su 2023		F 2029-Su 2030	
Sociology BA	2008	2015		2022		2029		
Child and Family Studies BA	2009	2016		2023		2030		
Humanities -BA	2009	2016		2023		2030		
Music B. Mus.	2012			2018?		2023?		NASM Fall 2012
Multidisciplinary Studies BA	2009	2016		2023		2030		
Applied Arts and Sciences BAAS		2016		2023		2030		
Petroleum Engineering BS (9/2011)								ABET F2014
Nursing BSN								CCNE Sp 2015
								Update 5-29-14

Attachment B

Program Review Calendar

DATE	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
March 1 year prior to review	Notification of review	Dean's Office
March 15 year prior to review	Meeting with program faculty	Dean
April 15 year prior to review	External review nominations with vitae of the nominees	Area Coordinators/Chairs
May 15 year prior to review	External review nominations to Provost	Dean
September 15	Common data provided	IRPE
October 1	Establish site visit dates	Dean and Provost
October 15	Selection of Review Team	Dean and Provost
October 15	First Draft of Self-Study	Faculty
November 1	Schedule developed for campus visit	Dean, Area Coordinators, Faculty
November 30	Notification of Selection to Review Team members with schedule for visit	Dean
January 9	Self-Study and other materials sent to review team members	Dean
January 30	Complete all arrangements for visit	Dean's Office
February 15 (initiation of visit)	Meet with Review Team members to discuss visit and expectations	Dean
February 16 (completion of visit)	Exit Conference with area coordinators and administrative personnel	Members of review team
March 16 (30 after site visit)	Submission of written review and evaluation of program(s)	Members of review team
April 15 (28 days after receipt of report)	Response to the written report submitted to Provost and VPAA	Dean and Area Coordinators
May 15	Discussion of response and recommendations of the review team	Provost, Dean, Dir IRPE and area coordinator for each reviewed program
July 1	Report to THECB on master's program review	Director IRPE
November (prior to budget) and May 15	Review of program's activities in response to the program review	Dean with area coordinator

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS OF THE PERMIAN BASIN

Conflict of Interest in Program Review Statement

Program review is a peer review process that requires representatives from other institutions to make decisions and recommendations for improvement of programs at all degree levels within the university. In order to maintain the credibility of those decisions and recommendations, peer evaluators must maintain a high level of integrity. Integrity in the process necessitates that reviewers have no conflict of interest in arriving at their decisions and recommendations.

Invited reviewers have a potential or actual conflict of interest when commitments and obligations to the University of Texas of the Permian Basin or to widely recognized professional ethics are likely to be compromised by their other interests or commitments. As examples, a peer reviewer would have a conflict of interest if he or she

a.   has been a consultant to the program in the last 5 years;
b. was employed within the program in the last 10 years;
c. has been an employee of The University of Texas of the Permian Basin in the last 10 years;
d. has been a candidate for employment in the program or a closely related program at the University in the last 10 years;
e. is a graduate of the program or a closely related program at the University;
f. has a close personal or familial relationship with persons employed within the program or a strong bias regarding the program; or
g. has any other personal, professional, or financial relationship that could serve as an impediment to rendering an impartial, objective, professional judgment about the program.

I have read the Conflict of Interest in Program Review Statement of The University of Texas of the Permian Basin. I have carefully reviewed my own situation in light of that statement. (Check the appropriate box.)

[ ] To the best of my knowledge and belief, I have no conflict of interest as a potential peer reviewer. I agree to notify the dean of the college in which I have been invited as a reviewer promptly if any situation or action that might be regarded as a conflict of interest with my duties as a peer reviewer should develop at any time during my peer review relationship with the college.

[ ] It appears that I have a conflict of interest with my expected duties as a peer reviewer and will be unable to serve.

SIGNATURE _____DATE ____

Seven-Year External Academic Program Review

Contents

INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth the process to be used to conduct the seven year review of academic programs. There will be a thorough review of the program review process at the end of each seven year cycle.

PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Above all else, the purpose of periodic program review is to provide a mechanism to ensure the improvement of academic programs on a continuous basis. Program review is a process for monitoring the status, effectiveness, and progress of academic programs; recognizing and responding to program strengths and weaknesses; identifying important directions in the disciplines or professions that need to be addressed; responding to the directives and incentives of the Board of Regents; the Texas Legislature and other external agencies; assessing the relationships among and contributions to other academic programs and the overall mission of the university; selecting among the opportunities and options available to the programs; and recognizing the implications of the choices made. Thus, program review is a process by which the future directions, needs, and priorities of academic programs can be identified. As such, program review is inextricably linked to strategic planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making at the program, department, college, and university levels.

The final outcome of program review is a plan for academic program improvement that is explicit, action-oriented, and includes a specific time frame. The program review process should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources currently available to the program. Consideration may be given to proposed program improvements and expansion requiring additional institutional resources; in such cases, the need and priority for additional resources must be clearly specified.

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CONDUCTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS REVIEW

The primary responsibility for overseeing the review of an academic program lies with the dean who has administrative responsibility for the program. It is anticipated that that the most common unit for review will be a single academic discipline, or a single interdisciplinary program.

Program review is considered to be a collective responsibility of the faculty in the unit. The unit being reviewed is responsible for preparing a self-study. The dean will work with the department chair and/or coordinator to ensure that the self-study is completed in a timely manner.

The unit will be responsible for preparing some of the data from department records. Other information will be provided by the Library, by the Information Resource Division, the Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research. The following data tables will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research.

1. Students enrolled
   A. Majors (undergrad only)
   B. Second Majors (undergrad only)
   C. Graduate students
2. Degrees conferred by year
3. SCH, FTE
4. ACT scores for undergraduates; SAT scores for undergraduates
6. GRE scores for graduate students
7. Undergraduate GPA for graduate students
8. Section size
9. Student demographic characteristics
10. Faculty/student ratio
11. Fall to fall retention rate
12. Time to degree of graduates
13. Graduation rates

SUGGESTED OUTLINE AND CONTENT FOR THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The self-study need not be long to be effective. Organization, focus on program planning, and coherence of the document as a whole are essential. The major sections of the self-study are designed to lead up to and *emphasize* the section on Unit Planning. Self-study discussions for graduate programs must be separate from those for undergraduate programs.

The connections among the elements of the self-study should be planned carefully. The strengths and weaknesses of the program should unfold out of the data, and the specific recommendations of the plan should follow from the strengths and weaknesses. Thus, in a tightly structured self-study, the data are an integral part of the developing plan. The result should be a relatively brief main document in the range of 25 to 40 pages including appendices.

Suggested Self-study Outline

A. Introduction: Mission and history
   1. Mission, philosophy, and focus of the unit
   2. Brief, recent history of the unit, focusing on developments during the last 7 years. Include the recommendations resulting from the last program review, and provide a detailed account of actions taken by the discipline in response to each recommendation.

B. Description of the unit, its administrative structure; its programs, and relevant policies (Note: section B is descriptive in character; evaluation of the program is to be saved to a later section)

   1. Program identification (identify any discrete programs, centers or institutes to be included in the self-study; also describe participation in inter-unit programs as appropriate)

2. Description of programmatic and curricular offerings, including majors, minors, graduate programs, distance education, and instructional service provided to other areas of the institution, (e.g. General Education courses). Describe program duration in comparison to peer programs.
3. Description of faculty resources
   a. From department/ program records, provide a semester-by semester account of faculty workload assignments (include detail within teaching, service, and research; e.g. courses taught, number of students advised, committee assignments, research projects, etc.) for the past two years.
   b. Include the following documents as appendices:
      i. short vitas (2-4 page) for all faculty
      ii. the unit's tenure and promotion criteria
4. Description of graduate assistant resources
5. Description of staff resources
6. Description of students in the program; advising and other student support services; for graduate programs, number of graduate students, listing of undergraduate institutions attended and performance on graduate admission tests (e.g., GRE, GMAT)
7. Student credit hour production per fall semester in total for the past seven years; SCH/FTE faculty member and student/faculty ratios.
8. Description of recruitment and retention efforts and fall-to-fall retention rates.
9. Description of student time-to-degree.
10. Number of degrees conferred annually and graduation rates.
11. Licensure rates for graduates (SOWK, PSYC)
12. Graduate Placement (i.e. employment or further education/training)
13. Description of facilities and equipment/instrumentation (available campus-or college-wide, as well as those dedicated to the program)
14. Description of information resources and services
15. Financial resources (e.g., budget by funding source; student scholarships and fellowships; sponsored funding received, and number and percentage of faculty with external funding)

C. Self-evaluation of programs, for each program identified in Section B.1 above. The self-evaluation should include an explicit statement of program strengths and areas of concern/weakness.

1. Quality
   a. Faculty quality and productivity. Address the questions; Are the faculty competitive on a national basis? On a regional basis? Note areas needing improvements as well as areas of strength. In addition to other data you choose to include, provide at least:
      i. *Number (on a per faculty per year basis) and quality of refereed publications and other work product. Provide an assessment of the <u>impact</u> of faculty's scholarly work on the field or discipline.*
      ii. *Adequacy of the standards described in the unit's/college's Promotion and Tenure document. If faculty accomplishments are rewarded in the merit process, are they necessarily making good progress toward tenure and promotion?*
      iii. *Describe the focus or foci of the research/creative enterprise of the unit. How do the unit's strengths help position it to achieve recognition on a national level?*
   b. Student accomplishments: List student publications and awards.
   c. Assessment of student learning outcomes, for all undergraduate and graduate programs, including majors, graduate degrees, and general education courses. Describe in detail the units' assessment program. Include copies of the unit's annual Institutional Effectiveness Plans (IEP).
      i. *Statement of student learning outcomes*
      ii. *Unit's assessment methods*
      iii. *Results of assessment and inferences drawn*
      iv. *Actions taken and program changes/improvements resulting from assessment*
   d. Any additional information on the quality of the curriculum, instruction, and support services.
   e. Quality and focus of the service component of the unit

  f. Comparative advantage and program distinctiveness, in terms of
    i. *Student served (geographic area, gender, and minority status, nontraditional students, etc.)*
    ii. *Program effectiveness, or "value added"*
    iii. *Other programs offered at UTPB and at other colleges and universities.*

2. Demand (recent trends, current levels, and projections)
 a. Instructional demand (actual seats enrolled), and breakdown by majors and non-majors or other categories appropriate to your unit.
 b. Employment demand for program graduates (placement of recent ....graduates; projections of labor market demand in areas relevant to the program)
 c. Demand for service programs

3. Alignment with the mission and goals
 a. Relationship of the program to UTPB's mission and goals and to the mission and goals of the College of Arts and Sciences.
 b. Relationship of the program to other programs at UTPB, including overlap or competition.
 c. Are the activities rewarded in the promotion and tenure process directly supportive of and consistent with the unit, college, and university mission?
 d. Are the teaching/learning, research/creative, and service missions of the unit related? If "yes," in what way and how closely?

4. Financial considerations and adequacy of resources
 a. Address the question: Does the Unit carry out its teaching, research/creative work, and service activities in a cost-effective way?
 b. Adequacy of resources

D. Unit planning (next 7 years) Based on the program's mission, its recent accomplishments, the strengths and weaknesses identified in the preceding material, and the perceived opportunities in academia and in the unit's area, **describe the unit's goals and plans for achieving them over the next seven years.** The plan should be within the context of currently available university resources. The plan may reference resources that the unit will generate through its own activities.

1. The plan referred to in this section should be consistent with any previously developed unit plan. The planning report should include at least the following elements:
 a. A description of the planning process in the unit
 b. Goals and strategies
 c. Timetable and implementation plan
 d. Questions the department asks the External Team to give particular attention.

E. Appendices
1. Tables, charts, and graphs that are referred to in the body of the self-study, but are not included therein
2. Relevant catalog materials describing the programs of the unit
3. Institutional Effectiveness Plans (IEP's) for each degree offered by the unit.
4. Copies of other reviews, reports, policy documents, student recruiting brochures, and other items appropriate to the self-study

THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

A. Purpose of the external review

The purpose of the external review is to provide a mechanism for assessment by recognized peers from outside The University of Texas of the Permian Basin.

B. Selection of the external review team and the schedule for the review

The review team will be comprised of recognized peers from distinguished programs at other universities and, where appropriate, from the professional sectors. Institutions shall use at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution of higher education outside the state of Texas. The unit chair or coordinator will provide names of potential reviewers. Working from this slate of potential reviewers, the chair/coordinator, the dean, and the Provost/Vice President will come to agreement on a list of potential reviewers. All parties will be sensitive to issues of conflict of interest at all levels and external reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review. For programs that are not administered through a college, the administrator to whom the program reports should perform the responsibilities identified herein as those of the dean.

The Provost is responsible for scheduling the travel and lodging arrangements for the external reviewers. Exit interviews with the dean and the Provost will also be scheduled by the Provost. The unit being reviewed is responsible for scheduling and coordinating all other aspects of the external reviewers' visit. Opportunities should be arranged for team members to meet with faculty members of the discipline (individually, if possible), department chairs program coordinators, and a sampling of undergraduate and graduate students. The schedule should be arranged to accommodate the reviewers' need to have time to work individually and as a team. The length of time the team is on campus will vary with the size and complexity of the program; a 11/2 day maximum visit should be sufficient for a review of the programs included in most academic departments.

C. Materials, information, and questions provided to the review team

Well in advance of the scheduled visit, the Provost will provide the following to each member of the review team. Copies of this material should be available to the unit undergoing the review.
1. The unit's self-study report
2. A preliminary schedule for the visit (with the understanding that the team may request additional or follow-up interviews or may otherwise choose to modify the proposed schedule)
3. An information sheet describing the expectations for the focus and content of the external reviewers' report (extracted from section E, below).

D. Focus of the external evaluation

The external review team should focus on the unit's goals and plans for achieving those goals within the context of all information provided in the self-study. In addition, the team should offer its observations and insights about how the unit contributes to the mission and plans of the college, other academic units, and the university as a whole. The Provost and dean have the final responsibility for assessing these aspects of the unit and its programs.

The team's recommendations should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources that currently are available to the program. If recommendations are made for changes that would require additional institutional resources, the need and priority for additional resources should be clearly specified.

E. Team Reports

The external review team should present its major findings and recommendations verbally during the exit interviews.

The external review team submits a single report, agreed upon by each of its members, within two to three weeks of departure from UTPB. It is submitted to the Provost, who distributes the report to the dean and the unit. The unit should call factual errors to the attention of the Provost as soon as they are recognized.

The External Report should include:
- A brief statement naming the unit being reviewed, the dates of the visit, and a summary of the major events or scope of the visit.
- An evaluation of the completeness and adequacy of the self-study.
- An identification of strengths and weaknesses of the unit. Do the unit's teaching and research/creative efforts reflect appropriate degrees of specialization and comprehensiveness? Is there evidence of innovation in teaching and research/creative work?
- An evaluation of the productivity of the faculty in teaching, research and service. Are the faculty competitive on a national scale?
- An evaluation of the leadership, including the climate for work created by administrators.
- An evaluation of the unit's plans for the next seven years. Are unit's goals and mission clearly articulated and appropriate? Do these plans reflect creative insights into the potential of the unit to contribute to the discipline and the University? Are the goals of the unit current, realistic and creative, in both teaching and research/creative efforts? Additional findings and recommendations, particularly those that could improve the plan or increase its chances for successful implementation.

THE UNIT RESPONSE

Following receipt of the External Report, the Chair/ Coordinator writes a "Unit Response" to the report within two weeks, and forwards this response to the Dean and the Provost. The Unit Response should focus on the recommendations in the External Report, and specifically to any particular recommendations that do not seem likely to lead to improvements for the program.

THE DEAN'S RESPONSE

The Dean's Response responds both to the External Report and to the Unit Response. In particular, it focuses on points of disagreement between those two documents. The "Dean's Response" commits the College to a course of action. The Dean's Response could endorse the External Report as written; it could commit to only specified parts of the External Report; it could adopt revisions suggested by in the Unit Response; or it could add recommendations overlooked in both documents. This is to be signed by the Dean, with a concurring signature from the Provost.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES AND ACTION PLANS

The dean will meet with appropriate representatives from the unit to discuss the program review. In addition to consideration of the External Review Committee's findings and recommendations, the discussion should include aspects of the review that concern how the unit contributes to other units of the university and how its activities and goals related to college and university strategic plans. Following this meeting, an implementation plan should be developed by the unit.

The unit is to make annual reports to the dean, recording progress on the specific recommendations produced by the series of documents and endorsed by the Dean's Response. The annual report should be written as responses to the individual numbered recommendations, including any requirements for improvement of graduate programs required by the THECB, and can be cumulative. By the time of the next program review, this file will contain a complete record of annual progress on the recommendations.

For graduate programs, the unit will prepare a summary of the programmatic self-study to be submitted to the Dean no later than 30 days after the written response from the reviewers is received. The dean's office will send

the summary of the programmatic self-study, a copy of the external reviewer's evaluation, and a copy of the dean's response with the concurring signature of the Provost within 60 days of the receipt of the external reviewers' written report. The Office of the Provost will transmit the materials to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division of the THECB.

External Review Team Visit and Report Guidelines

UT Permian Basin

Purpose of Periodic Academic Program Review

Above all else, the purpose of periodic program review is to provide a mechanism to ensure the improvement of academic programs on a continuous basis. Program review is a process for monitoring the status, effectiveness, and progress of academic programs; recognizing and responding to program strengths and weaknesses; identifying important directions in the programs or professions that need to be addressed; responding to the directives and incentives of the Board of Regents; the Texas Legislature and other external agencies; assessing the relationships among and contributions to other academic programs and the overall mission of the University; selecting among the opportunities and options available to the programs; and recognizing the implications of the choices made. Thus, program review is a process by which the future directions, needs, and priorities of academic programs can be identified. As such, program review is inextricably linked to strategic planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making at the program, department, college, and university levels.

The final outcome of program review is a plan for academic program improvement that is explicit, action-oriented, and includes a specific time frame. The program review process should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources currently available to the program. Consideration may be given to proposed program improvements and expansion requiring additional institutional resources; in such cases, the need and priority for additional resources must be clearly specified.

Focus of the External Review Team

The external review team should focus on the quality of the program – the disciplinary, student outcome, and uniqueness or needs perspectives of quality (see additional handout entitled *Three Perspectives on Academic Quality*). Attention should be paid to the program's goals and plans for achieving those goals within the context of all information provided in the self-study and gained through the on campus interviews. In addition, the team should offer its observations and insights about how the program contributes to the mission and plans of the college, other academic units, and the university as a whole.

The team's recommendations should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources that currently are available to the program. If recommendations are made for changes that would require additional institutional resources, the need and priority for additional resources should be clearly specified.

External Review Team Report

The external review team should present its major findings and recommendations verbally during the exit interview.

The external review team will provide a written evaluation of each program including an assessment of its strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for future direction of the program. The external review team

submits a single report, agreed upon by each of its members, within two to three weeks of departure from UTPB. It is submitted to the Provost, who distributes the report to the Dean and the program faculty. The program faculty should call factual errors to the attention of the Provost and the Dean as soon as they are recognized.

The External Report should include the following for each program reviewed (e.g., B.A. in Criminology, M.A. in Psychology, B.S. in Kinesiology):

- A brief statement naming the program being reviewed, the dates of the visit, and a summary of the major events or scope of the visit.
- An evaluation of the completeness and adequacy of the self-study.
- An assessment of the overall quality of the program
- An identification of strengths and weaknesses of the program. Do the program's teaching and research/creative efforts reflect appropriate degrees of specialization and comprehensiveness? Is there evidence of innovation in teaching and research/creative work?
- An evaluation of the productivity of the faculty in teaching, research and service. Are faculty members competitive on a national scale?
- An evaluation of the leadership, including the climate for work created by administrators.
- An evaluation of the program faculty's plans for the next five years. Are the program's goals and mission clearly articulated and appropriate? Do these plans reflect creative insights into the potential of the program to contribute to the College and the University? Are the goals of the program current, realistic and creative, in both teaching and research/creative efforts? Additional findings, particularly those that could improve the plan or increase its chances for successful implementation.
- A list of program improvement recommendations related to the future directions, needs, and priorities of academic program. These recommendations should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources that currently are available to the program. If recommendations are made for changes that would require additional institutional resources, the need and priority for additional resources should be clearly specified.