ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON
(Revised 2024)

CONTENTS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

INTRODUCTION

Regular in-depth review of academic programs is required under Academic Program Review Policy contained in the *UT Arlington Handbook of Operating Procedures* (**AA-PRS-PO1**) and conforms to requirements specified in Texas Administrative Code Rule 5.2.. Academic program review (APR) Is a methodical process that evaluates the status, effectiveness, and progress of academic programs and provides the program and administration of UT Arlington with insight into how the program can improve and evolve. The information gathered in the APR process consists of the program's self-study, findings and recommendations of external reviewers, and a formal response addressing the reviewers' comments. This information informs discussion and planning involving the program, Academic Dean and Provost. It is also conveyed to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for their consideration and comment.

The conduct of a program review is a major event in the life of an academic program, and preparation for and conducting the review it is time consuming. If the process is regarded as simply an administrative hurdle to be passed, little of a positive nature will result. Instead, the program review process should be treated as an opportunity to review assumptions, present a comprehensive description of the program (to the program's own faculty as well as to external reviewers and university administrators), and to evaluate the program's strengths and weaknesses. If this is done well, new insights will be gained, new opportunities identified, and the effort will have been warranted.

TERMS AND DESCIPTION OF ROLES ASSOCIATED WITH PROGRAM REVIEW

The following provides brief definitions of terms and roles critical to understanding the APR process.

Academic Program Review (APR): UTA procedure under which undergraduate and graduate programs at UTA undergo systematic review at least once every 10 years. Programs that undergo rigorous, periodic review by an accrediting agency follow the guidance provided by their accreditor and use the products of that activity to meet reporting requirements of the Program Review Policy and Texas Administrative Code Rule 5.2.

Accreditor Review: Many programs are accredited by professional organizations by meeting exacting professional, academic and organizational standards. These accreditors conduct regularly scheduled reviews to verify that those standards are upheld. Programs undergoing such reviews are not reviewed under the UTA APR process. Instead, these programs submit materials to the Provost that they prepare for their accreditors. These include an in-depth self-analysis of the program (with an added executive summary) and the assessment made by the accrediting agency that identify the areas where standards are met successfully, areas requiring improvement and possible areas for future development. Programs undergoing review by

accreditors also submit a response to the report of the accrediting agency that highlights areas of agreement, disagreement and identifies plans for improvement.

UTA Academic Program Review Schedule: The 10-year cycle on which a program/department undergoes review follows   a multi-year master schedule of, that is updated as needed by the Provost's Office and the Office for Institutional Reporting and Effectiveness and maintained by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Program Review Committee (PRC): The APR process is guided by the Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC is the university level committee consisting of faculty appointed by the Provost. It oversees the aggregate of all reviews being conducted at any given time. It is also responsible for solving problems that may arise during program reviews.

Program Review Committee Chair (PRC Chair): The PRC Chair is appointed by the Provost and oversees and coordinates the activities of the PRC and the Program Review Teams. The Chair is also a resource for help to resolve issues that may arise during course of any UTA Program review.

Program Review Team (PRT): A program review team (PRT) is formed by the PRC Chair and assigned to each academic program undergoing review. Each team consists of at least four individuals. Two are UTA faculty members, one of whom is typically a member of the PRC. Neither of these members are affiliated with their assigned program. Two external reviewers complete the PRT. The UTA members of the team facilitate the organization of a two-day program site visit that involves all 4 PRT members and scheduled discussion with program administrators, faculty, staff, and students. They distribute the final version of the program's Self-Study to the PRT's external reviewers, the program's Academic Dean, the Provost, and the Chair of the PRC. The external members of the PRT write a report based on information provided in the Self-Study prepared by the program and gathered during the site-visit to assess the program and make recommendations for improvement. The UTA members of the PRT collect and distribute the external reviewers' report.

PRT Chair: With the approval of the PRC chair one of the UTA members on the PRT will serve as chair of the PRT. This person is typically a current PRC member or a person who has served on a PRT in the past, The PRT Chair assures that process and procedures are completed in a timely manner. The chair is the main point of contact for the external members of the PRT and is the interface between reviewers, the program being reviewed and the PRC. The PRT chair is the primary channel through which any communication between the external reviewers on the PRT and the program flow. The PRC communicates to the PRT and the program primarily through the PRT Chair.

External Members of the PRT: Two external members are recruited to serve on the program's PRT. These reviewers are recognized experts in and leaders of the program's discipline. They are chosen through a consultative process involving the program, the PRT and the PRC. These two external reviewers are required to write a report based on information provided in the Self-Study prepared by the program and information gathered during a site-visit.

External Reviewer Appointment Letter: Formal appointment letters will be provided to individuals who are willing and qualified to serve as external reviewers by the Provost's Office. The PRT Chair will provide the Provost's Office with the external reviewers' contact information.

External Reviewer Travel and Honorarium Costs: The Department being reviewed is responsible for arranging and paying for transportation, lodging, meals, honorarium, and other matters associated with the PRT's activities. Funds for these expenses will be transferred to the department by the Provost's Office.

Report to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB): The Provost Office will send the Program's executive summary of their Self-Study, the PRT Report or the report of findings of an accrediting agency and the program's response to those reports for the THECB review and comment. The THECB requires that this step be completed within 90 days after the Report of the PRT is submitted. The scheduling of the program review and follow-up steps take place in time to meet that deadline. Feedback from THECB concerning the findings of the program review will be shared with the Academic Dean and program by the Provost.

Report of the PRT: One month after completing the site visit the two external members of the PRT submit a final report of their observations and conclusions concerning the status of the program and a prioritized list of action items they believe will benefit the program and the University. UTA members of the PRT will assist the external reviewers while they write the report as needed. However, UTA members will not write the report. The external reviewer report is shared with the PRC, department, college dean, and members of the Office of the Provost when it is submitted.

Self-Study: The foundational and critical component of the program review is the Self-Study developed by the academic program. The Self-Study provides an opportunity for the program to assemble a complete picture of its activities, and to offer its own views on needed enhancements or corrections. It is shared with the PRT, the Academic Dean and the Provost at least a month before the scheduled site visit. It is a critical background document that informs the PRTs understanding of the program, helps guide discussions during the site visit and shape the reviewers' formal report and evaluation of the program.

Site Visit: Each program undergoes a two-day site visit by the PRT. The site visit allows the team to explore topics prompted by the Self-Study and gain a deep understanding of the program that will inform their final report. The UTA members of the team help the program schedule and organize the two-day program site visit. The visit consists of scheduled meetings and discussion involving the entire PRT and program administrators, faculty, staff, students, and any other relevant groups.

Program Response to the PRT Report: The program will submit a response to the PRT Report, discussing points of agreement or disagreement with the observations and conclusions of the reviewers. It must include a discussion of plans to implement actions recommended in or

stimulated by that report. The Program submits its response directly to the Academic Dean and Provost within a month of the date on which the external reviewer report is received.

Program, Academic Dean and Provost Meeting to Review Reports: The program will meet with their Academic Dean and Provost to review the external review report to discuss the Self-Study and external reviewers 'report. The program may wish to amend their response to the external reviewers' comments in light of this discussion.

Follow-up: One-year and again five years after the program review is completed program leaders, the Academic Dean and the Provost meet to discuss progress on responses to recommendations developed during the program review.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The University of Texas at Arlington requires that each academic program at UTA undergoes rigorous review at least once every 10-years as per Texas Administrative Code Rule 5.2 and University policy AA-PRA-PO1. These reviews include both degree and certificate programs. Programs will either undergo review conducted by to a process overseen by the UT Arlington's Provost, Program Review Committee and an assigned Program Review Team, or a rigorous review by an accrediting agency in accordance with the accreditor's review guidelines. Programs that undergo review by UT Arlington will be reviewed as described below. In accordance with Texas Administrative Code 5.2 and University policy AA-PRA PO1, programs reviewed by accrediting agencies will submit materials to the Provost that were prepared for their accreditors, supplemented with executive summaries and a formal reaction to the review which addresses issues raised in that review and plans for program development and growth.

Programs Undergoing the UT Arlington Academic Program Review Process: The following outlines the major aspects in the UTA process for conducting Academic Program reviews:

1. **Notification of Upcoming Program Review:** Each program undergoing review is notified by the Provost's Office of their upcoming review 9-12 months prior to when a Self-Study must be completed and a site visit by reviewers scheduled.
2. **Identification of "core faculty" in doctoral programs:** The core faculty in doctoral programs must be identified as early as possible because that information is needed to create several critical reports, some of which take some effort for programs to compile and summarize. Core faculty are appropriately qualified faculty members (e.g., a person who holds a terminal degree in the program's disciplinary area and is an approved appointee to the graduate faculty a core faculty member is a person who is/was a key (as opposed to less central) contributor to the education of graduate students and the overall mission of the graduate program). Core faculty are those who have done any of the following on a *regular* basis over the past 5 years:
    - taught courses in the doctoral degree program curriculum,
    - mentored or advised doctoral students in the degree program, and

- served on examining or supervisory committees of doctoral students in the degree program.

3. **Task Completion Dates:** The program review process involves several steps that must be completed in a certain order and by certain dates to assure that the results can be reported by University Administration to The Higher Education Coordinating Board by a deadline set by that Board. A schedule containing the timeframe in which each of the various steps and elements of the UTA academic program review process should be completed is provided below. It should be followed as closely as possible to assure that the reporting deadline is met.

4. **Self-Study:** Upon notification of their up-coming review, the program will prepare a Self-Study using the outline of the Program Self-Study provided below. The outline provides guidance on writing each section of the Self-Study and poses relevant questions for programs to consider. Data reported in the Self-Study are obtained from various administrative programs including the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Reporting, the Office of Financial Aid, University Analytics and the program's own internal resources. A list of data that must be analyzed in the Self-Study are provided in a table located in a file titled "Self-Study Data and Sources which describes the data and identifies their source(s),

5. **Assignment of the Program Review Team**: The program undergoing review will be assigned a Program Review Team that will initially consist of two UTA faculty members who are not affiliated with the program. The Program Review Team will be expanded to four members after the initial members and the program identify and recruit two acknowledged experts in the field who are from programs nationally recognized for excellence in the program's discipline.

6. **Recruitment qualified external reviewers:** Details of the recruitment process are contained in a file titled *External Reviewer Selection Process*. The program will use a form titled *External Reviewer List and Ranking* to identify possible external reviewers for the UTA members of the PRT. The PRT will contact selected candidates, describe the review process and expectations. Their search ends when two candidates agree to join the Program Review Team and serve as external reviewers.

7. **Planning and scheduling site visit by the PRT and Program:** A key part of the program's program review is a two-day site visit by the program's PRT after they have had the opportunity to study the program's Self-Study. The Program has primary responsibility for identifying the dates on which the site visit will occur and creating the schedule of meetings that will occur during the site visit. A template of a suitable meeting schedule can be found in the file labeled *UTA Program Review Site Visit Schedule Template*. This template may be adapted as needed to assure that a thorough and complete review will be conducted. The UTA members of the PRT will assist the program in the site visit planning and scheduling and distribute the final schedule to the external members of the PRT, the Provost, the Academic Dean, and the PRC Chair.

8. ***Travel, Food, Lodging and other Payments:*** The program will be expected to arrange and pay for the external reviewer's travel, food and lodging costs. It will also arrange to pay an honorarium to the external reviewers. The Provost's Office will transfer

funds to the program for these purposes. The procedure for making these arrangements and transfer of funds is describe in a separate document titled ***Funding: Honoraria, Travel and Meals***.

9. **Distribution of the Self-Study.** At least one month prior to the scheduled site visit, the program will provide the UTA members of their PRT with the final version of their Self-Study. They will distribute it to the external reviewers, the Academic Dean, the Provost and the PRC Chair.

10. **Report of the PRT:** One month after completing the site visit, the external members of the PRT are expected to submit a final report of their observations and conclusions concerning the status of the program and a prioritized list of action items they believe will benefit the program and the University. The UT Arlington members the PRT will assist the external reviewers while they write the report as needed. However, they will not write the report. A template for this report is provided, ***Report Template for the Program Review Team.*** The final report is distributed by the PRT Chair to the program, college dean, members of the Office of the Provost and the PRC Chair

11. **Program Response to the PRT Report:** The Program will prepare a formal response to the PRT Report. It should be a narrative that discusses points of agreement or disagreement with the observations and conclusions contained in the Report of the PRT. It must also discuss plans to implement actions recommended in or stimulated by that report. There are no other format or content requirements, and no sample report template is available. The Program Response is due no later than one month after receipt of the PRT report. The Program will provide their written response to their PRT. The PRT Chair will distribute it to the Provost, Academic Dean and PRC Chair.

12. **Review and Discussion:** A meeting between program leadership, Provost and Academic Dean will review and discuss the Report of the PRT and the Program Response. The program may wish to amend their response to the reviewers' comments in light of this discussion.

13. **Submission to UT System/Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board:** When the above steps are completed, the Provost's Office will approve submission of required documentation to the UTS/THECB by the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness for their review and comment. Those comments will be shared with the Academic Dean and program.

14. **Follow-up:** One-year and again five years after the program review is completed, program leaders, the Academic Dean and the Provost meet to discuss progress on responses to recommendations developed during the program review.

Programs Undergoing Program Review by an Accrediting Agency: Many programs are accredited by professional organizations if they meet exacting professional, academic and organizational standards. These accreditors conduct regularly scheduled reviews to verify that those standards are upheld. Programs undergoing such reviews are not reviewed under the UT Arlington APR process. Instead, these programs will submit materials to the Provost that were prepared for their accreditors. The following outlines the major steps in the program reviews conducted in compliance with external accrediting agency review requirements.

1. **Notification of Upcoming Program Review:** Each program undergoing program is notified by the Provost's Office of their up-coming program review 9-12 months prior to the anticipated date of the review by the accrediting agency.
2. **Reports and Documentation for Accrediting Agency:** The program prepares and submits all reports and supporting documentation required by accrediting agency to that agency. These reports include a detailed Self-Study of the program.
   a. These documents must also be sent to the Provost and Academic Dean.
3. **Review by Accrediting Agency:** Accrediting agencies are expected to conduct their review of the program following their organizations' policies and procedures. This will include a written report of their findings and recommendations.
4. **Departmental Response to Accreditor Review:** The department is expected to submit a response to the review provided by the accrediting agency to the Provost discussing points of agreement or disagreement with the observations and conclusions of the reviewers. It must also include a discussion of plans to implement actions recommended in or stimulated by that report.
5. **Submission of Documents to the Provost and Academic Dean:** The following documents from the accreditation review and supplementary documentation required by UT Arlington must be submitted to the Provost and Academic Dean by the program undergoing review:
   a. The program's Self-Study required by the accreditors with an executive summary.
   b. A description of areas where the accrediting agency's standards are met successfully, areas that the accrediting agency concluded require improvement and areas the accrediting agency may have indicated may offer new opportunities for the program in the future. An executive summary of those findings may be needed to highlight their key observations and conclusions. If so, the program must prepare it.
   c. A narrative response by the program to the report of the accrediting agency that highlights areas of agreement, disagreement and identifies plans for improvement. This must be submitted with the accrediting agency report or prepared executive summary of that report. Both are due approximately 30 days of receipt of the accrediting agencies report on the program.
6. **Review and Discussion:** The department will meet with their Academic Dean and Provost to review the Self-Study prepared for the accrediting agency, accrediting agency's report on the program and the program's response to that report. The program may wish to amend their response to the accrediting agency's report in light of this discussion.

7. **Reporting to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board:** The Provost Office will send the program's executive summary of their Self-Study, the external reviewer report and the department response to the external reviewer for THECB review and comment. Those comments will be shared with the Academic Dean and program.
8. **Follow-up:** One-year and again five years after the program review is completed, program leaders, the Academic Dean and the Provost meet to discuss progress on responses to recommendations developed during the program review.

TIMELINE FOR CONDUCTING AND COMPLETING THE UTA PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

This table provides a timeline for completing various tasks required in the UT Arlington Program Review Process and specifies those who are responsible for completing those tasks. It is also available in a separate Word document titled "Timeline".

The following things need to be started early because they take some time to complete.
1. Use the List of Faculty Report provided by University Analytics and identify core faculty in doctoral programs over the past 5 years.
2. Send a list of these core faculty (must contain names and IDs) to Academic Resource Planning to obtain a report on core faculty funding over 5 years.
3. Collect and summarize core faculty scholarly activities over last 5 years.
4. Contact Financial Aid to obtain required reports on student.

	Timeline	Program Review Team Tasks
during.	*Summer Term*	Begin program Self-Study (Dept. Chairs, and faculty). Core faculty in master's and doctoral program must be identified from list of faculty provided by UA. A list of core faculty must be sent to Academic Resource Planning for report on core faculty funding. Use the list to identify and summarize scholarly works and activities of each core faculty member.
approx.	Mid-September	Program Review Teams appointed (PRC Chair).
approx.	*Mid-September*	UT Arlington members of each PRT select chair and inform PRC Chair of choice.
during.	Mid-September- Mid-October	PRT meets with program, discusses review, tentative dates for on-site review, and identifies possible external reviewers. Use External Reviewer List and Ranking Form to list 3-6 potential external reviewers and submit to obtain approval from PRC Chair.
approx.	*Mid-October*	PRT Chair contacts external reviewers, describes process, general time frame, travel arrangements, compensation, etc., and supplies each a copy of the Program Review Manual and Conflict of Interest Attestation Form.

approx.	End of October	PRT Chair receives external reviewer's agreement to serve, signed copy of the *Conflict of Interest Attestation Form,* vita and contact information. If a reviewer is unable or unwilling to participate PRT chair, contacts next candidate on list.
approx.	*End of October*	PRT Chair sends copy of signed copy of the *Conflict of Interest Attestation Form*, current vita and contact information.to PRC Chair. Also assures that external reviewer contact information has been received by the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed.
approx.	End of November	PRT and department finalize specific dates for on-site review and visitation schedule (daily itinerary of meetings during the on-site review), Due to limited schedule flexibility tentative dates and times for the on-site visit and meetings involving the Provost and Academic Deans meetings during the on-site visit must be accepted by the Provost and Academic Deans before finalizing the schedule. Site visits are to occur in November, December or February.
during	*At least 4weeks prior to the date of the scheduled site visit* a	Finalized schedule of PRT on-site review provided to Programs, Provost's office, Academic Deans, PRC Chair and external members of the PRT.
	At least 4weeks prior to the date of the scheduled site visit	After review of the final draft of the Program Self Study by the Academic Dean, program provides final copy to PRT chair who distributes it to the PRT members (including external members, PRC Chair, Academic Dean and Provost
during	*November-February*	Conduct on-site program reviews.
no later than	*One month after site visit*	The Report of the PRT including an executive summary of that report are submitted to PRT chair by the external reviewers. If the report is in final form, the PRT chair submits it to the program, Academic Dean and Provost and PRC

		Chair. However, if reviewers ask that the report be reviewed for factual correction before finalizing it, the PRT chair will forward it to the Program Chair for their corrective input. Corrections are to be returned to the PRT Chair within one week. The PRT Chair will then return the corrected document to the external reviewers who will amend the report as necessary and, within 1 week, return the final version of the report to the PRT Chair who will then distribute it to the program, Academic Dean, Provost and PRC Chair..
no later than	*One month after External reviewer's final report is distributed (December-March)*	The Program Chair creates the Program Response to the PRT Report and submits it to the PRT Chair. The Chair distributes the response directly to Academic Dean, Provost, and PRC Chair.
Immediately	*After PRC chair receives receipt of the Program Response to the PRT Report*	PRC Chair sends self-study, PRT Report and Program Response to the PRT Report to IER.
		IER arranges meeting between Provost, Academic Dean and Program Chair to discuss PRT report and program's response to it.
		Provost's Office prepares institutional response to external review and submits it to IER.
		IER submits Program Self-Study, PRT Report and the institutional response to the PRT Report to UTS/THECB.
During	*Fifth year following the completion of the Program Review. Meeting date is arranged by IER.*	Department, Academic Dean and Provost meet to discuss progress on responses to recommendations developed during program review.

OVERVIEW THE PROGRAM SELF-STUDY

The Self-Study conducted by the program undergoing review is the foundational document of the academic program review. The Council of Graduate Schools *Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs* (2011) has an economical way of defining the purpose of a Self-Study.

A Self-Study should answer the following five questions:
   a) What do you do?
   b) Why do you do it?
   c) How well do you do it, and who thinks so?
   d) What difference does it make whether you do it or not?
   e) How well does what you do relate to why you say you do it?

Additionally, Texas Educational Code 5.2 requires that masters and doctoral programs include a discussion of a number of very specific types of data that range over missions, curricula demographics, financial support, enrollment, degree completion, post-graduation employment, productivity and impact. Data sets and sources relevant to these questions and requirements are described file titled "***Data and Analyses"***.

An outline or template for a Self-Study is provided below in the section of this document titled ***Detailed Outline of the Program Self-Study.*** It provides the general structure and content for self-studies written for purposes of the UT Arlington Program Review. The outline divides the content of the self-study into 8 broad topic areas. These are:

   a) MISSION, ADMINISTRAION, CONTEX AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM
   b) DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM
   c) DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY
   d) DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENTS
   e) DESCRIPTION OF THE STAFF
   f) DISCUSSION OF FACILITIES
   g) PROGRAM BUDGET
   h) EVALUATION OF THE STATE OF THE PROGRAM AND PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

The goal for the program writing a self-study is to present a coherent, complete data-driven analysis of the program for the PRT to review. Data that must be considered in each major topic area and in various subtopics under them are identified and questions that require attention are noted in the ***Detailed Outline of the Program Self-Study*** section that follows. Other information may be added to these required analyses to supplement or expand the discussion. University Analytics (UA), Financial Aid, the Office of Research and each program's internal records are the major sources data that will be examined under each topic.

SOURCES OF SELF-STUDY DATA

A file titled "**Data and Analyses**" lists data that must be included in program self-studies and who is the source of them. A wide range of data spanning mission, curricula, demographics, financial

support, enrollment, degree completion, student success, faculty productivity and impact are described.

DEFINITIONS OF A PROGRAM'S FACULTY

Undergraduate and graduate programs are assessed with similar but not identical types of data. A critical difference concerns how faculty are to be defined in program analyses. For undergraduate and master's programs, faculty are those individuals with a faculty title who have taught courses in the program's curriculum. A more restrictive definition of faculty is used in analyses involving faculty in doctoral programs. State regulations require that these analyses consider the contributions of what are called "core faculty". A core faculty member is a person who is/was a key (as opposed to less central) contributor to the education of doctoral students and the overall mission of the graduate program. There is no centralized resource that lists core faculty because a core faculty member must be defined by each program based on appropriate disciplinary and practical considerations. Identification of core faculty requires a thoughtful process that identities those who regularly contributed significantly to the supervision, mentoring, and teaching of doctoral students and the overall success of their doctoral program. University Analytics will provide lists of all faculty employed by a program during each of the reporting years. Programs offering doctoral degrees must review this information and create a list of those who are core faculty. This list will be used in various analyses reported in the self-study related to core faculty teaching and scholarly activity.

DETAILED OUTLINE OF THE PROGRAM SELF-STUDY

The following lists the sections of program Self-Study and describes content that should be addressed in each. Questions to consider in most sections of the self-study are included. Programs should give them appropriate attention and feel free to consider other relevant questions that may arise.

MISSION, ADMINISTRAION, CONTEX AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

LAST FORMAL REVIEW

A. Provide the date of last formal external review.

B. Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations.

Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon. This is not necessary if the program has not been previously reviewed.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A. Name and Title of Each Person in Administrative Chain from President to Program Director or Chair

The objective of this section is to provide an unambiguous picture of the leadership of the program. In most cases, the picture will be quite simple: President, Provost, Dean, and Chair. However, in interdisciplinary programs, where authoritative leadership could be an issue of concern, the picture may be more complex, and must be presented.

B. Organizational Structure

As in the preceding section, the objective is to eliminate ambiguities. To whom does the program report, and where does the program fit in the organization of the university?

What is the internal organization of the program? Who is responsible for curriculum development, student advising, supervision, etc.? Are there major subdivisions? If so, who leads them and what titles do those persons carry? Is the program administered by more than one academic program?

C. Questions to consider in relation to internal organizational structure

- *How do faculty participate in program governance?*
- *Do non-tenured and/or adjunct faculty participate in program governance?*
- *Do students participate in program governance?*
- *Is the program administered by more than one academic program?*

PROGRAM MISSION, PURPOSE, AND GOALS

A. University Mission Statement

Insert the approved UT-Arlington Mission Statement here. The next few items are intended to connect the program's mission statement to that of the program's College and the overall university.

B. School or College Mission Statement

Insert the approved School or College Mission Statement here. This statement must connect to the university mission statement above and to the department and/or program mission statement below.

C. Department and/or Program Mission

Insert an authoritative statement of the mission of the program within the overall university context. This must involve an explicit treatment of the connection of the specific mission of the program to the university's and college's/school's missions.

D. Educational Objectives of Programs

Describe the educational objectives of the program. Include reference to preparation of students for licensure or certification if appropriate and any special outcomes or competencies which the program provides. If the program includes multiple curricula (degrees, concentrations, emphases, options, specializations, tracks) describe the educational objectives of each.

E. Alignment of Program with Goals and Objectives

Describe how the program's objectives align with the mission of the college and the University.

F. *Questions to consider*

- *What trends are emerging within the program's discipline? Does the program address these trends? Do these trends suggest a need for a change? What role does the program play regionally, in Texas, nationally, and internationally?*
- *What student populations does the program serve? From where does the program draw its students? How does the program's recruiting strategies align with the program's goals and student populations.*

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

A. Summary of Degrees and/or Certificates Offered by Program

List all degrees and/or certificates that the program is authorized to award.

B. Degree and Certificate Requirements

For each element of the program, list the completion requirements and describe the program structure. Where applicable, show the intended course sequence by semester and year. If the program includes multiple curricula (degrees, concentrations, emphases, options, specializations, tracks) describe the requirements of each. Where they exist, discuss any special graduation requirements such a field experience, capstone design projects, theses, thesis

substitutes, dissertations, student teaching, licensing examinations, clinicals, practicums, internships, etc. If the program has a foundation, core curriculum, or other similar requirement, it should be described.

Describe how the rigor and depth of instruction increases across degree levels. Provide 3 sets of sample syllabi that demonstrate this.

Compare program curricula and durations to at least 3 peer programs. It is not necessary to do a comparative analysis of certificate program curricula.
- *What are the major similarities and differences?*
- *What are comparative strengths and weakness of the program?*
- *Describe any notable or unique ways the program differs from these peers and/or typical programs offered by the discipline.*

Questions to consider in relation to degree requirements.

C. Formats of Study

Describe methods of instruction e.g., online, hybrid/in person used to by each degree and certificate program. Describe any on/off-campus instruction, non-traditionally scheduled classes, etc. Describe enrollment in each instructional format. How many students in each degree program, track and certificate are considered fully online students, mixed online/in person students or fully in- person students.

Calculate the number of students who graduated over the past 5 years who competed their degrees entirely on-line, mixed, or entirely face-to face courses.

D. Questions to consider in relation to formats of study

- *Is student demand for different course formats currently met and will they be able to be met in the future? Are there plans to provide more or less access to different modes of instruction?*
- *What steps have been/will be taken to assure learning outcomes in courses are the same regardless of instructional mode?*

E. Admission

State the critical admissions requirements for each degree and certificate program. If there are different categories of admission, e.g., unconditional, probationary, provisional, pre-candidacy, post-candidacy, pre-professional

program, etc., describe each. Provide links to sections in the University Catalog that describe these requirements for each program. *Describe the process by which the program arrives at an admission decision. Describe any factors that limit admission of qualified applicants.*

- *Are the current admission requirements satisfactory? Do they yield students who are successful in the program and in their subsequent careers?*

- *Are any changes admission criteria or the admission decision making process being considered? If so, what are the purposes of these changes and how will they help improve admission outcomes?*

- *What, if any problems in processing applications for admission need to be addressed to make the process simpler and/or to become more efficient in terms of time and effort?*

F. Student Advisement

Describe the advising systems used to advise undergraduates, master's, doctoral and non-degree seeking graduate students (e.g., certificate students and other non-degree seeking students). How are students assigned to advisors?

Describe resources available to promote undergraduate student success and learning e.g., Student Success Help Desk (SSHD), University Tutorial and Supplemental Instruction, SOAR, Trio Program, IDEAS, McNair Scholars Program etc. Provide use statistics if available.

Describe opportunities for academic and non-academic career development or available to undergraduate majors, master's, and doctoral students. (Note: The Career Development Center tracks actual participation by major and the Grad School tracks participation in academic and professional development workshops by department/college and can provide relevant data]. Are all advisors and mentors offered training opportunities to prepare for these roles and is there support for improvement?

J. Faculty Availability Requirements

What are the program policies on the faculty's availability to students? What office hours are to be maintained? How are online resources used to improve student access to faculty?

K.   Associated Organized Research Centers

List all approved organized research centers that are associated with the program. Define the academic role that they play in the program, list the director of the center, and state whether the center is active or inactive.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FACULY

A.   Faculty Profile

A.   Faculty Profile

List current faculty members, indicating highest earned degree and institutions, field of study, current teaching assignments, current research area, date of appointment.

Describe the required credentials/qualifications for hiring tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Provide appendix with current vitae of faculty employed in most recent Fall Term.

Briefly describe the program's tenure and promotion standards for tenure-stream faculty and retention and promotion guidelines for non-tenure stream faculty.

Present and discuss the number faculty of full-time and part-time, by rank who have participated in the program by year over the past five Fall Terms.

Present and discuss the number of faculty by title/rank and tenure/nontenure track status that have participated in the program by year over the past five Tall Terms

Report the number of new full-time faculty hired by rank and tenure/tenure track and the number of tenure/tenure track faculty departures per year over the past 5 years.

How successful has the program been in attracting, mentoring, and retaining high qualify, faculty? Are there plans to improve faculty recruiting and retention practices?

B.   *Faculty Participating in Undergraduate Programs.*

Discuss the role of tenure and non-tenure stream faculty in undergraduate programs. Programs offering only undergraduate degrees should include

discussion of data reported in previous section on rank, non-tenure-tenure track status in discussing the roles of the faculty. Programs that also offer master's and/or doctoral degree, must include all faculty, including core faculty who teach at the undergraduate level, in their discussion of the role of faculty in undergraduate education.

C. *"Core Faculty" Participating Doctoral Degree Programs*

Core faculty in doctoral programs must be identified. Core faculty are appropriately qualified faculty members (e.g., holds a terminal degree in the program's disciplinary area and is an approved appointee to the graduate faculty) who has done any of the following on a regular basis over the past 5 years is a core faculty member in that degree program:

- *taught courses in the graduate degree program curriculum,*

- *mentored or advised graduate students in the degree program,*

- *served on examining or supervisory committees of students in the degree program.*

Describe the rational used to differentiate core from non-core doctoral programs.

Present the headcount of doctoral program core faculty by gender, ethnicity title/rank and tenure/non-tenure track status employed by the program in Fall Terms over each of the last five Fall Terms.

D. *Faculty Teaching* Load

What are the departmental policies on faculty course load?

What has been the typical course load by tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (or load broken down by faculty titles/ranks) over the past 5 years.

How does service and research activity affect the course load assigned to faculty?

Doctoral programs must also report the average SCH teaching load of faculty teaching load in organized courses during in each of the last 5 academic years. Organized classes include lecture, laboratory, and seminar courses.

E. *Student/faculty Ratios*

Provide the average full-time student equivalents divided by full-time faculty equivalents based on all faculty with teaching responsibilities in each of the last 5 Fall Terms.

Doctoral programs must also report the number of full-time student equivalents divided by the number of full-time faculty equivalents of core faculty in each of the last 5 Fall Terms.

F. Faculty Scholarly and Research Activities

Summarize and discuss the scholarly productivity and accomplishments of the faculty in each of 5 most recent years. Report the average number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per faculty members during each of the past 5 years. Data reported may be adjusted and discussion focused on information that best address disciplinary expectations and the program's mission within their College and the University.

Doctoral programs must also report the research and creative works of core faculty. report the average number of discipline-related refereed papers/ publications, juried creative/ performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per faculty members during each of the past 5 years. Comment on faculty productivity as it relates to that of peer programs and college and university goals.

Summarize and discuss the external support obtained by the faculty. Report the number of faculty receiving external funding, the average amount of funding awarded and the total external funding obtained by the program's faculty (the sum of funding across all awardees) Discuss these data with regard to disciplinary expectations and the program's mission within the University.

Doctoral programs must also report the averages of the number of core faculty receiving external funding, the average amount of funding awarded and the total external funding awarded (the sum of funding across all awardees) in each of the most recent 5 years. Discuss these data in regard to disciplinary expectations and the doctoral program's mission within the University.

Describe significant university, community, statewide, national, and international service, awards, and recognition earned by the faculty over the past 5 years.

Comment on faculty productivity as it relates to that of peer programs and program, college, and university goals.

G. Graduate Teaching Assistants

Describe the departmental practices concerning the preparation for and assignment of teaching duties and roles to graduate students.

Describe policies related to use of graduate students as instructors of record.

Provide a 5 -year history of the use of GTAs as teaching assistants (assisting in a course) and as classroom instructors of record.

H. *Faculty Evaluation and Support of Excellence*

Describe the program's evaluation practices. How have these practices led to efforts to improve or enhance faculty professional success and faculty teaching.

What resources are available to faculty that support improvements?

What evidence from the past 5 years indicate that these resources and practices have led to instances of improved teaching and/or improved student learning outcomes?

How is excellence acknowledged?

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENTS

UNDERGRADUATES

A. *Undergraduate Degree-seeking Student Diversity/Demographics and Enrollment*

Report the fall semester headcount by gender, ethnicity (White, Hispanic, Black or African American, Asian, American Indian or Alaskan Native, International, Unknown or Not Reported, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander) and residency status (Texas resident, out-of-state non-resident, and international non-resident) in the program for each of the 5 most recent years separately for BA, BS, and BFA programs. International non-

resident students should include all students paying resident tuition rates because of waivers.

Report headcount of full-time and part-time undergraduate majors in each degree program of the 5 most recent.

Report the headcount of BA, BS, and BFA majors and SCH produced by each of these majors in each of the most recent 5 years.

Report headcount of non-majors enrolled in program's courses and SCHs produced by non-majors in each of the most recent 5 years.

Discuss the impact of non-major student enrollment on the operation of the program(s).

B. Undergraduate Degree-seeking Student Performance, Retention and Completion

Report separately the average GPA of sophomore, junior and senior BA, BS, and BFA students over the last 5 years.

Report separately the number of BA, BS, and BFA degrees awarded in each of the 5 most recent academic years.

Report the average time to degree of BA, BS, and BFA students by ethnicity and residency of students graduating in each of the 5 most recent years. Compare the average time degree of majors to the average time to degree of all UTA under graduates.

Describe the one-year retention rate of new majors. Present the number of students enrolled and percentage of students continuing after their first year in BA, BS and BFA program in each of the most recent 5 years.

Report the percentage of graduating with a BA, BS, or BFA degree within 4 and 6 years.

C. Undergraduate Degree Recipients Licensure and Employment

What job market needs does the program prepare students to meet *Texas and U.S.?* What evidence is there of the likely career outcomes of the program's graduates? *Use. Data   from by prospective employers, professional associations and   employment databases such as those provided by the* Bureau of Labor Statistics, UTS Texas Labor Market Dashboard, Texas Workforce Development Toolkit, Texas Workforce Commission, Seek UT . *to describe those needs and outcomes.*

Describe to the extent possible the employment profile of graduating students within one year after graduation for each of the 5 most recent years. Use data from the graduating student exit survey conducted by IER, departmental surveys or other resources. Ideally, the profile for any given year should show the number and percent of students employed in their field within one year of graduation, number and percent of those pursing additional education, number and percent of those still seeking employment, and number and percent of students with unknown employment information. Employment includes full-time self-employment, private practice, residency, fellowship, and other opportunities.

If applicable, report the number and percentage of graduating students passing licensure examinations in each of the last 5 years.

D. *Undergraduate Degree-seeking Student Financial Support*

Report the average number of loans, scholarships, fellowships, assistantships received by undergraduates in each of the 5 preceding years.

Report the average Institutional Financial Support Provided undergraduate degree seeking students. This is the average annual monetary institutional support provided per full-time student from scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits) for each of the 5 most recent years.

E. *Undergraduate Certificate Programs Diversity/Demographics and Enrollment*

Note: There are two general types of certificate programs. One is a certificate program available to non-degree seeking students who apply and are admitted as "Certificate" students. The other is sometimes referred to as a "certificate in passing" program where a degree-seeking student may be awarded for completing certain course work that is part of their degree requirements.

Report the Fall Term headcount by gender, ethnicity and residency status of students participating in certificate programs in each of the 5 most recent years. International non-resident students should include all students paying resident tuition rates because of waivers.

F. *Undergraduate Certificate Program Completion*

Report the number of Certificates awarded in each certificate program in each of the 5 most recent years.

Report the average time of students enrolled as Certificate students to complete the certificate in each of the 5 most recent years for certificate program offered. "Time to complete" is defined as the beginning the year the students started the certificate program and ending in the year the certificate was awarded.

Report the percentages students enrolled as Certificate students completing in two years (6 terms) from date of matriculation as a certificate seeking student in each of the most recent 5 years.

G. *Undergraduate Student Learning*

This section should focus on, but is not limited to, undergraduate learning outcome assessment conducted via the Unit Effectiveness Process (UEP). Questions about this section or requests for UEP data can be directed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Reporting (817-272-3365) or UEP@uta.edu.

Describe what has been discovered about student learning since the last program review:

> *Provide the rationale of the outcome assessment strategy (e.g., Was it driven by achievement metrics? Areas of concern within the curriculum?).*

> *Summarize and characterize the selected outcomes. Consider if they were focused on a particular area of the curriculum, capstone experience, etc. There can be several areas of focus.*

> *Describe in summary the results of the assessed outcomes with attention given to areas where students did not meet the expected level of performance.*

> *Explain how the assessment data informed any improvements to the curriculum/services that were intended to improve student learning, including a summary description of implemented improvements (i.e., actions intended to improvement student learning).*

> *Describe any re-assessments of outcomes and speak to any demonstrated improvements in student learning that resulted.*

GRADUATE STUDENTS

Note: You may choose to organize the report on graduate students in several ways. For example, you may report and discuss data on master's or doctoral students in separate sections devoted to each type of student or where similar data are evaluated you analyze and discuss each type of student together. The following

outline generally follows the latter approach. In either case, data on certificate seeking students should be treated in a separate section under

A. *Graduate Degree-Seeking Student Diversity/Demographics and Enrollment*

Report separately for master's and doctoral students the fall semester headcount by, ethnicity and residency status (Texas resident, out-of-state non-resident, and international non-resident) in the program for each of the 5 most recent years. International non-resident students should include all students paying resident tuition rates because of waivers.

Report the number of full-time and part-time graduate students in each graduate degree programs using Fall Term enrollment data over the 5 most recent years.

For doctoral students, report the percentage of full-time doctoral students in each of the 5 most recent years (definition of "full-time student" is 18 semester credit hours (SCH) per year).This calculation is done by dividing the number of full-time doctoral student equivalents by the headcount number of doctoral students.

B. *Graduate Degree-seeking Student Completion*

Report the number of master's and doctoral degrees awarded in each of the 5 most recent years.

For each of the most recent 5 years, report separately the average time to complete the master's and doctoral degrees., "Time to degree" is defined as beginning the year students matriculated with a master's or doctoral degree objective until the year the degree was awarded.

For each of the most recent 5 years, report the percentage of master's students completing in 3 years.

Report the percentage of doctoral students who graduated within 10 years for each of the 5 most recent years.

C. *Graduate Degree-Seeking Student Publications/ Scholarly Achievements*

Report separately the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and external presentations per year for master's and doctoral students in each of the 5 most recent years.

D. *Graduate Student Employment and Licensure*

> *What job market needs does the program prepare students to meet? Provide evidence of the workforce need for the program's graduates in the Texas and U.S. job markets. Use evidence from employers, professional association data and in employment databases such as those provided by the [Bureau of Labor Statistics](), [UTS Texas Labor Market Dashboard](), [Texas Workforce Development Toolkit](), [Texas Workforce Commission](), [Seek UT]() .*

E. *Graduate Degree Recipients Employment*

> *To the extent possible, separately describe the employment profiles of graduating master's and doctoral students within one year after graduation for each of the 5 most recent years. The profile for any given year shows the number and percent of students employed in their field within one year of graduation, number and percent of those pursing additional education, number and percent of those still seeking employment, and number and percent of students with unknown employment information. Employment includes full-time self-employment, private practice, residency, fellowship, and other opportunities.*

F. *Graduate Degree Recipients Passing Licensure Examinations*

> *If applicable, report the number and percentage of graduating masters and students passing licensure examinations in each of the last 5 years.*

G. *Graduate Student Financial Support*

> *Report the average Institutional Financial Support Provided into students in master's and doctoral programs. This is the average annual monetary institutional support provided per full-time student from scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits) for each of the 5 most recent years.*

> *Report the percentage of full-time students in the master's and doctoral programs with at least $1,000 of annual support for each of the 5 most recent years.*

> *Describe how students are currently selected for assistantships and the qualifications the must meet to be appointed and to continue their appointments.*

> *Describe the number and percentage of master's students and the number and percentage of doctoral students employed as 20-hr per week GTAs,*

GRAs or a 20-hr per week combination of GTA and GRA in Fall Term over each of the last 5 years.

Describe compensation currently paid to students employed as full time (20hr per week) assistants. Describe the current salary scale applied to GTA's and GRAs. Does salary increase as students progress? Do these appointments provide tuition and healthcare support?

H. Graduate Certificate Programs Demographics and Enrollment

Note: There are two general types of certificate programs. The first is a "stand-alone" certificate, which is a certificate program available to non-degree seeking students who apply and are admitted as "Certificate" students. The second is a "certificate in passing" program where a degree-seeking student may be awarded for completing certain course work that is part of their degree requirements.

Report the fall semester headcount by gender, ethnicity and residency status of students participating in certificate programs in each of the 5 most recent years. International non-resident students should include all students paying resident tuition rates because of waivers.

Report the average credit hours taken in each term of enrollment by students enrolled as Certificate students in each certificate program in each of the five most recent years.

F. Graduate Certificate Program Completion

Report the number of Certificates awarded in each certificate program in each of the 5 most recent years.

Report the number of certificates awarded to degree seeking students in each certificate program in each of the 5 most recent years.

Report the average time of students enrolled as Certificate students to complete the certificate in each of the 5 most recent years for certificate program offered. "Time to complete" is defined as the beginning the year the students started the certificate program and ending in the year the certificate was awarded.

Report the percentages students enrolled as Certificate students completing in two years (6 terms) from date of matriculation as a certificate seeking student in each of the most recent 5 years.

G. Graduate Student Learning

This section should focus on, but is not limited to, graduate student learning outcome assessment conducted via the Unit Effectiveness Process (UEP). Questions about this section or requests for UEP data can be directed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Reporting (817-272-3365) or UEP@uta.edu.

Describe what has been discovered about student learning since the last program review:

Provide the rationale of the outcome assessment strategy (e.g., Was it driven by achievement metrics? Areas of concern within the curriculum?).

Summarize and characterize the selected outcomes. Consider if they were focused on a particular area of the curriculum, a capstone experience, etc. There can be several areas of focus.

Describe in summary the results of the assessed outcomes with attention given to areas where students did not meet the expected level of performance.

Explain how the assessment data informed any improvements to the curriculum/services that were intended to improve student learning, including a summary description of implemented improvements (i.e., actions intended to improvement student learning).

Describe any re-assessments of outcomes and speak to any demonstrated improvements in student learning that resulted.

DESCRIPTON OF THE SUPPORT STAFF

The levels and nature of support staff vary widely from program to program. The intention here is to describe the numbers and roles of support staff funded by the teaching and research budget of the program.

Discuss significant challenges and possible solutions to meet support staff needs.

Can solutions to challenges supported by existing budget?

DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITIES

    A.   Teaching or Related Facilities

        What teaching or related facilities (classrooms, laboratories, studios, etc.) are required for the program?

        What is the state of those facilities?

        Does a realistic plan exist to maintain and update the facilities? Is the plan supported by an existing budget or a commitment from the university?

    B.   Specialized Facilities

        Are specialized academic facilities required for the programs that are not discussed above (incinerators, furnaces, air filtering systems, etc.)? What is the state of those facilities? Does a realistic plan exist to maintain and update the facilities? Is the plan supported by an existing budget or a commitment from the university?

    C.   Research Facilities

        What research facilities exist and are required for the program?

        What is the state of those facilities?

    Does a realistic plan exist to maintain and update the facilities?

        Is the plan supported by an existing budget or a commitment from the university? What is the usage factor for research facilities and justify the continued allocation of space to them.

PROGRAM BUDGET

    A.   Teaching Budget

        Show the history of the program's teaching budget and its individual categories Describe any significant challenges regarding the teaching budget. Are there realistic plans to meet those challenges in the future?

    B.   Research Budget

        Show the history of the program's research budget, its sources and its utilization. Are the plans that will lead to an increase in this budget?

C. Special Allocations and/or State Line Items

List any special university allocations to the program over the past seven years, and any state line items the program has received.

EVALUATION OF THE STATE OF THE PROGRAM AND PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

This section of the self-study is intended to offer the opportunity for the faculty, students, and program administrators to give their candid assessment of the state of the program. The format and content of this section will vary from program to program. While considerable latitude is offered in formulating this section, it should be specifically keyed to the objective data provided above wherever feasible. In most instances, the program's participants will find it beneficial to have the bulk of the first eight sections completed before beginning this penultimate part of the self-study.

Consider the overall goals, trends, opportunities and challenges for the department, its current and future research vitality and potential.

Describe possible new degree programs, degree tracks, certificates and/or research centers that might be proposed over the next 10 years. Explain why these areas may be pursued.

Executive Summary of the Program Self-Study

An Executive Summary of the Self-Study must be provided and submitted with the full report. Generally, the Executive Summary should provide an overview of major findings, identifying key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats revealed in each area examined in the Self-Study.

An outline that may be followed to organize the Executive Summary of the Self Study is provided in the file "Example Executive Summary of the Self Study".

Format for Program Review Team Report

The Program Review Teams report consists of an Executive Summary and full report. A template that can be used to help structure them is provided in the file titled **Report Template for the Program Review Team**. The Executive Summary should be 1-2 pages in length (maximum). The full report should be a narrative written jointly by the external reviewer describing their findings, conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations should be prioritized by the reviewers. There is no set page requirement for the full report.

Format for Program Response to the Program Review Team Report

There is no suggested template or particular format for the Program's response to the Review Team's report. A thoughtful analysis of the Team's reported findings and recommendations is required. This discussion should lead to a plan that responds to critical recommendations, and a timeline for implementing steps in that plan, The plan should specify points in time where progress will be assessed.

RESOURCES

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS INFORMATION

> **Selecting and Recruiting External Reviewers**
> > See file titled "Process for Selecting External Reviewers"

> **External Reviewer Travel Expenses and Compensation**
> > See file titled "Funding: Honoraria, Travel and Meals**"**

> **Site Visit Scheduling**
> > See file tiled "Scheduling a Site Visit"
> > See file titled "UTA Program Review Site Visit Schedule Template"