



PROGRAM REVIEW MANUAL
(Revised 2-21-14)

- I. General Guidelines for Preparation of a Unit Self-Study
- II. Sample Outline of a Unit Self-Study
- III. List of Measures that **MUST** be Included in Self-Studies of Master's and Doctoral Programs and Data Sources
- IV. Program Review Data Elements and Sources for Self-Study
- V. Self-Study Executive Summary
- VI. Program Review Team Final Report Template
- VII. Academic Program Review at The University of Texas at Arlington: Responsibilities and Procedures of Program Review Committee and Program Review Teams
- VIII. Compensation, Travel and Meal Arrangements During Site-visit
- IX. Draft Site-visit Schedule
- X. Program Review Committee Management Schedule
- XI. General Outline of the Timeline for Tasks Performed by the PRT
- XII. Appendix 1: Academic Program Review Assessment Data Template and Guide

I. General Guideline for Preparation of a Unit Self-Study Program Review Committee

**August 1, 2005
(revised February 21, 2014)**

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs The University of Texas at Arlington

A. INTRODUCTION

The following guidelines are based upon the principles outlined in the UT-Arlington Academic Program Review Policy dated March 10, 1997. That document discusses the overall process of program review and the roles of the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the Program Review Team (PRT). The PRC is the university body overseeing the aggregate of all reviews being conducted at any given time. A PRT is formed for each academic program to be reviewed and involves both internal and external members.

The purpose of program review is to evaluate the teaching, student learning, research, and service activities of each academic program on a regular schedule, and to advise the administration of UT-Arlington of ways in which the program can be made more effective. The unit self-study provides the opportunity for the academic program under review to assemble a complete picture of its activities, and to offer its own views on needed enhancements or corrections. The unit self-study is the most important source document that the PRT will receive prior to its visit.

B. DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM

For purposes of Academic Program Review, an academic program is defined by the combined undergraduate and graduate educational programs of a discipline and the associated scholarly and service activities of its academic unit(s). The latter includes any organized research centers operating under the oversight of the academic unit(s). In order to be reviewed separately under this policy, a unit must have tenured or tenure-track faculty members officially affiliated with it and must offer instruction leading to the award of academic degrees.

In many instances an academic department best defines the boundaries of an “academic program,” e.g., Physics, English, etc. In other cases, two or more programs may be housed within a single department, e.g., Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering. For such situations, the two programs are reviewed as separate entities, but at the same time to minimize duplicative preparation. In still other cases, a program may be housed in and defined by a school or center, e.g., The School of Urban and Public Affairs or the Center for Professional Teacher Education. The PRC is responsible for resolving any issues of academic program definition.

C. FREQUENCY OF REVIEWS

Academic programs are reviewed at nominally seven-year intervals or more frequently if the Provost and the PRC Judge determine that circumstances in a program warrant an earlier date. If an academic unit’s programs are subject to rigorous, regular external accreditation review, those programs are exempt from academic program review. Thus, the College of

Engineering's undergraduate programs are assessed by ABET and are exempt from academic program, whereas its graduate programs are not.

D. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF PROGRAM FOR REVIEW

Selection of the units to be reviewed in a given year is based on a master schedule that is approved by THECB and maintained by the Program Review Committee Chair. Notice will be given to the academic unit being reviewed at least nine months before the reviews should be completed

E. RESOURCES AND REFERENCE MATERIALS

The guidelines for Academic Program Review have been developed from a number of sources that are available in the Office of Graduate Studies, including the following publications.

Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement. Commission on Colleges; Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: Decatur, Georgia, 2009.
<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2010principlesofaccreditation.pdf>

Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs. Council of Graduate Schools: Washington, DC, 2011.

Handbook of Operating Procedures; University of Texas at Arlington; Subchapter 6-1250 Academic Program Review Policy. Available at
<http://www.uta.edu/policy/hop.adm/6/1250>

Master's Education: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators. A Policy Statement. Council of Graduate Schools: Washington, DC, 2005.

The Doctor of Philosophy Degree. A Policy Statement. Council of Graduate Schools: Washington, DC, 2005.

Team leaders for unit self-studies should consult guides to program review and assessment published by their disciplinary professional associations and any of the standard references on educational assessment for discussion of outcomes assessment. Some suggested standard references on assessment practices include:

Banta, Trudy (2002) *Building a Scholarship of Assessment*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bresciani, Marilee J. (2006) *Outcomes-based Academic and Co-curricular Program Review*, Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Palomba, Catherine A., & Trudy W. Banta (1991) *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs. A Policy Statement. Council of Graduate Schools: Washington, DC, 2005.

Ph.D. Completion and Retention: Analysis of Baseline Program: Data from the Ph.D. Completion Project. Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC, 2008.

Team leaders may also contact the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE) for an extensive list of assessment resources, some of which can be accessed through the IRPE library.

E. POLICY STATEMENT

The University of Texas System requires that all academic programs be reviewed regularly to evaluate their quality and their effectiveness in supporting the University's mission. The Program Review Committee (PRC) is a standing committee to oversee the review process.

F. U.T. SYSTEM POLICY GUIDELINES ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Meaningful and well-formulated processes for periodic reviews of academic programs and for ensuring responses that implement actions suggested by such reviews are fundamental and vital to the maintenance and augmentation of academic quality. Accordingly, each component institution shall formulate, document and implement a policy that will ensure a process of regular, substantive reviews of the quality of its academic programs.

In view of the variety of missions and operations of component institutions with the U.T. System and of the complexity of precisely defining an "academic program," each component institution shall construct a policy appropriate to its needs and institutional character for inclusion in the institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures.

Such policies should incorporate elements, which ensure:

- a) assembly and dissemination of relevant objective data bearing on program quality;
- b) participation by faculty, staff, and students within the academies unit under review;
- c) participation by faculty and administrators from the broader university community;
- d) wherever appropriate, participation by relevant members of the external community;
- e) whenever appropriate, participation by distinguished scholars and administrators from other institutions;
- f) mechanisms for maximizing the probability that the conclusions of the review process become part of a coordinated programmatic improvement;
- g) maximization of efficiency and minimization of personnel and material costs, by coordination with or substitution by such institutionally mandated reviews with externally mandated reviews, such as SACS, ABET, and AACSB reviews.

G. MAJOR ELEMENTS OF A UNIT SELF-STUDY

The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) has an economical way of defining the purpose of a self-study. The first CGS document cited above states:

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?

Translating these questions into principal headings, the major elements of a self-study must encompass:

- a) Mission, Objectives, and Context of the Program
- b) Measures of the Program's Size and Scope
- c) Description of Faculty
- d) Description of Student body
- e) Presentation of the Curriculum for Each Separate Element
- f) Discussion of Facilities
- g) Measurements of the Program's Impact and Productivity
- h) Assessment of the Quality of the Program
- i) Recommendation for Improvement

In Section II, a sample outline for a self-study is provided in the next section of this Manual that addresses these matters. However, the manner in which these elements are to be addressed will vary from one program to another, and the sample outline is not intended to be followed rigidly where logic dictates otherwise. The important matter is for the faculty and administration of the academic unit to present a coherent, complete picture for the PRT to review. In a number of places, historical trends are an important element of the analysis. In such instances, data should be presented for the preceding seven years, if it is available. IRPE can assist in providing data sets that are collected centrally, but departmental sources are likewise important.

It should also be noted that in 2011, The Coordinating Board specified measures that master's and doctoral programs must evaluate. These are included in the sample outline and are listed separately in Section III. While master's and doctoral program must include these measures in their self-studies, additional data should be included to ensure that the report is thorough, complete and coherent.

H. SUMMARY

The conduct of a program review is a major event in the life of an academic unit, and the preparation of well-written, candid self-study is a great deal of work. 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 much as to the PRT or university administrators), and to evaluate the program's strengths and weaknesses. If this is done well, new insights will be gained by all involved, and the considerable effort involved will prove to have been warranted.

II. Sample Outline of a Unit Self-Study

DATE OF LAST FORMAL REVIEW

- A. Provide the date of last formal external review. If applicable, give the name of body, and date of last program accreditation review.

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 unit?

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 each subordinate unit's and the program's mission statement to that of 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 Statement

Insert an authoritative statement of the mission of the program within the overall university context. This must involve an explicit flow down of the university's and college's mission to the more specific mission of the program.

D. Educational Objectives of the Program

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. Program Context

The Objective of this section is to place the program within the discipline. How does it align with stated program and institutional goals and purposes? What role does the program play regionally, in Texas, nationally, and internationally? From where does the program draw its students? Where do its students go upon graduation? What are the characteristics of the job market they enter, and what is the long-term outlook?

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 and give the date of first approval and last Academic Program Review.

B. Degree and/or 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 as 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. Compare program curricula and durations to 5 peer programs.

C. Admission

State the admissions requirements for each program element. If there are different categories of admission, e.g., unconditional, probationary, provisional, pre-candidacy, post-candidacy, pre-professional program, etc., describe each. If applications for admission are screened as a group and/or numerical quotas are set, discuss the procedures and rationale.

D. Faculty/Student Ratios

Describe the seven year history of the faculty/student ratio for undergraduate and master's. For doctoral programs provide the rolling three-year average student-core faculty ratio.

E. Student Advising

Describe the advising system used in the program. Is advising centralized or decentralized? How are students assigned to advisors?

F. Transfer Students and Articulation Agreements

Discuss the process for admission and advising of transfer students. State any special restrictions on transfer students. If articulation agreements are employed, describe their nature and the means employed to ensure that the quality of programs from which students come are of adequate quality.

G. Non-Traditional Students

Where applicable, describe the arrangements serving non-traditional students, e.g., non-traditionally scheduled classes, delivery of instruction by telecommunications, on line and/or off-campus instruction sites, special library services, arrangements for student registration and advisement, etc.

H. Faculty Availability Requirements

What are the program policies on the faculty's availability to students? What office hours are to be maintained? Does the department have a policy on the use of e-mail for faculty-student communications? Are instructors expected to have web pages for their courses? Are "chat rooms" encouraged for student-to-student and faculty-student communications? Is support staff available to assist in creating and maintaining such capabilities?

I. Student Course Evaluations

What are the program policies on student course evaluations? Are all courses evaluated each semester? How are data tabulated? What use is made of the data? How are course evaluations used to enhance teaching?

J. 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.

THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY

A. Faculty Profile

Provide at least a seven-year history of the size of the faculty (full-time, part-time, visiting, tenure track, non-tenure track, graduate faculty, new faculty hired, faculty departures, average age by rank, average salary by rank, gender, ethnicity, percent tenured, etc.). What are the departmental policies on course load? What is the teaching load credit history for the program? Doctoral programs must provide the number of core faculty and describe the

teaching load of the core faculty in the prior year. Provide the departmental policy on the use of graduate teaching assistants. Provide at least a seven-year history of the use of GTAs as classroom instructors. Describe the program's teacher evaluation practice and give results of the practice in terms of student evaluations, corrective actions, and efforts to enhance faculty teaching.

B. Faculty Backgrounds

List current faculty members, indicating highest earned degree and institutions, field of study, current teaching assignments, current research area, date of appointment, etc. Standard vitas should be provided as an attachment to the self-study.

C. Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities

Describe the research, scholarship, and creative activities of the faculty. Characterize their individual productivity, the proposals submitted, and the external grants and contracts funded. In the case of creative activities in arts or architecture, provide a characterization of the exhibitions and awards of the faculty members.

Doctoral programs must provide the rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/ publications, juried creative/ performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per core faculty member.

Doctoral programs must provide the rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant dollars per faculty and total external grant dollars received by the program per academic year.

THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS

A. Student Profile

Characterize the student body according to citizenship, average age, gender, ethnicity, part-time/full-time status. Doctoral programs must also report the percentage of full time (≥ 9 SCH) doctoral students enrolled for the last three fall semesters. Provide a history of the program's enrollment, student credit hours and degrees/certificates granted in all separate elements (degree programs, certificate programs, etc.). Doctoral programs must report the average number of doctoral degrees granted per year contained in the 18 Characteristics report. What are the average standard test scores for each element of the program (SAT, ACT, GRE, GMAT, etc.)?

For doctoral students, provide the three-year average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year.

- B. Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition Rates
Provide data regarding distribution of grades in courses (separately for undergraduate, master's and doctoral students). Describe degree-completion rates, retention, attrition, average time-to-degree. Doctoral programs must provide the rolling three-year average of the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years and the average of the registered time to degree of first-year doctoral students within a 10-year period.

Provide data on graduate licensure rates (if applicable), master's and doctoral student publications and awards and graduate student post graduation placement (e.g., employment or further education/training). Doctoral programs must report the percentage of the last three years of graduates employed in academia, post-doctorates, industry/professional, government and those still seeking employment (in Texas and outside Texas).

Directly compare completion, retention, and attrition rates in doctoral programs with similar programs at Tier 1 or Tier 1 aspirant public institutions in Texas. Are the program's rates acceptable or unacceptable?

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has identified a set of 18 important characteristics of doctoral programs and mandated that each public university with active doctoral programs must collect and publish online the data associated with these characteristics. These reports contain data on doctoral student completion and retention rates that must be examined. The Doctoral Program Characteristics report for UT Arlington programs is maintained online by IRPE at <http://www.uta.edu/irp/PhD/index.htm>. Benchmarking the program under review against similar programs in Texas Public Universities classified Research Intensive or Research Universities is very important. Comparisons between the program and similar programs in Texas Public Universities classified Research Intensive or Research Universities must be reported. IRPE has prepared a list of the relevant Texas Public Universities with links to their reports:

Texas A&M	http://ogs.tamu.edu/prospective/18-characteristics-doctoral-programs.html
Texas Tech	http://www.depts.ttu.edu/gradschool/grdschInfo/DocProg18.php
U of Houston	http://www.uthouston.edu/dotAsset/1586840.pdf
UNT	http://www.unt.edu/ir_acc/theccb/index.htm
UT Austin	http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/admissions/characteristics.html
UT Dallas	http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/phd18point.htm
UT El Paso	http://cierpdata.utep.edu/DoctoralProgramsUTEP/Home.aspx
UT San Antonio	http://www.utsa.edu/ir/DoctoralProgramReviews/work.html

If the program's doctoral completion and retention falls short of that reported by other institutions, data relevant to assessment of possible causes is provided by IRPE in the provided Completion-Retention Triangle Report. This report tracks sample cohorts (Fall Term admits only) of students over a ten year span and should be used to try to identify possible underlying factors. You may ask IRPE for more granular analyses of the data provided in the Triangle Reports as needed.

C. Student Financial Support

What percentage of the students receives financial support? What is the history of departmental and institutional funding for student support? What is the average level of support provided? What are the principal sources of support (loans, scholarships, fellowships, research grants and contracts, etc)? Provide the numbers of research and teaching assistantships supported by the program for at least the past seven years. In the numbers of assistantships, provide measures of the percentage of support provided. Doctoral programs must report the number percentage of FTS (≥ 18 SCH) with support and the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year including research assistantships, teaching assistantships fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc.

D. Assessment of Student Outcomes

Use the template and guide provided in Appendix 1, to describe evidence of student learning and briefly summarize how the data was collected (e.g. through assessment of written work, exhibitions, oral presentations, multiple-choice testing, licensing examination results etc.). In the description, please ensure that data gathered through indirect measures (i.e. student surveys, exit interviews and employment placement) is used only as support for data collected through direct measures. This section must include a description of how the department used the assessment data to improve student outcomes.

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.

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? Justify the continued allocation of space to them. Provide a measure of grant and/or contract support that has resulted from the facilities. How many students have been associated with the facilities, and how many have received their degrees as a result of work done using them?

PROGRAM BUDGET

A. Teaching Budget

Show the history of the program's teaching budget and its individual categories.

B. Research Budget

Show the history of the program's research budget, its sources and its utilization.

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

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.

III. List of Measures that MUST be Included in Self-Studies of Master's and Doctoral Programs and Data Sources

In 2011, The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) adopted a policy on Academic Program Review of master's and doctoral programs, specifying measures that must be evaluated in a unit's Self-Study of these programs. The measures are listed separately for master's and doctoral programs below. Units with master's and/or doctoral programs should use these lists to verify that the required measures have been evaluated in their Self Studies. The section in the *Sample Outline of a Unit Self-Study* (see Section II) where these measures appear and the source of the data for each are also provided.

MASTER'S PROGRAMS:

Criteria for the review of *master's* programs must include, but are not limited to:

(A) Faculty qualifications;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Backgrounds
Data Source: Departmental Records

(B) Faculty publications;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities
Data Source: Departmental Records

(C) Faculty external grants;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities
Data Source: Departmental Records

(D) Faculty teaching load;

Assessed in Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Profile
Data Source: Departmental Records

(E) Faculty/student ratio;

Self-Study section: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, Faculty/Student Ratio
Data Source: IRPE Department Profile

(F) Student demographics;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
Data Source: IRPE Department Profile

(G) Student time-to-degree;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition Rates
Data Source: IRPE Department Profile

(H) Student publication and awards;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition and Attrition Rates

- (I) Student retention rates;**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
 Data Source: IRPE Department Profile
- (J) Student graduation rates;**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
 Data source: IRPE Student Profile
- (K) Student enrollment;**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
 Data source: IRPE Student Profile
- (L) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
 Data source: Departmental Records
- (M) Graduate student placement (i.e. employment or further education/training);**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
 Data source: Alumni Office/Departmental Records
- (N) Number of degrees conferred annually;**
 Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
 Data source: IRPE Student Profile (7-year history in each degree program)
- (O) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;**
 Self-Study section: PROGRAM MISSION, PURPOSE AND GOALS
 Data Source: Department, College and University Mission statements
- (P) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;**
 Self-Study section: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, Degree and Certification Requirements
 Data Source: Program identifies 5 programs that it believes are its peers for comparison.
- (Q) Program facilities and equipment;**
 Self-Study section: DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITIES
 Data Source: Departmental Records
- (R) Program finance and resources;**
 Self-Study section: PROGRAM BUDGET
 Data Source: Departmental Records
- (S) Program administration**
 Self-Study section: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION
 Data Source: Departmental Records

DOCTORAL PROGRAM MEASURES:

Criteria for the review of **doctoral programs** must include, but are not limited to:

(A) The 18 measures contained in the *Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs Report*

(the measures included in that report are listed in the following table as are the sections of the *Outline of a Unit Self-Study (Section II)* where they appear.)

Data Source: <http://www.uta.edu/irp/PhD/index.htm>.

Measure	Operational Definition	Self-Study section:
Number of Degrees Per Year	Rolling three-year average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
Graduation Rates	Rolling three-year average of the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
Average Time to Degree	Rolling three-year average of the registered time to degree of first-year doctoral students within a ten year period	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)	Percentage of the last three years of graduates employed in academia, post-doctorates, industry/professional, government, and those still seeking employment (in Texas and outside Texas)	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition
Admissions Criteria	Description of admission factors	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, Admission
Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Financial Support	In the prior year, the percentage of FTS (≥ 18 SCH) with support/the number of FTS	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Financial Support
Average Financial Support Provided	For those receiving financial support, the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year, including research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc. that is "out-of-pocket"	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Financial Support

(Doctoral Program measures, continued)

Measure	Operational Definition	Self-Study section:
Student-Core Faculty Ratio	Rolling three-year average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) /rolling three-year average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, Faculty/Student Ratio
Core Faculty Publications	Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/ publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per core faculty member.	THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities
Core Faculty External Grants	Rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant \$ per faculty, and total external grant \$ per program per academic year	THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities
Percentage Full-Time Student	Rolling three-year average of the FTS (≥ 9 SCH)/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS
Number of Core Faculty	Number of core faculty in the prior year	THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Profile
Faculty Teaching Load	Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty in the prior year	THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Profile
Faculty Diversity	Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender, updated when changed	THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY, Faculty Profile
Student Diversity	Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program in the prior year	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
Date of Last External Review	Date of last formal external review, updated when changed	Date of last formal review
External Program Accreditation	Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed	Date of last formal review
Student Publications/ Presentations	Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/ publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year per student	THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion, Retention and Attrition

(Doctoral Program measures, continued)

(B) Student retention rates;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Profile
Data Source: IRPE Department Profile, Doctoral Completion-Retention Triangle Report and 18 Characteristics Report

(C) Student enrollment;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student profile
Data source: IRPE Student Profile, 18 Characteristics Report

(D) Graduate student licensure rates (if applicable);

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS, Student Performance, Success, Completion ,Retention and Attrition
Data Source: Departmental Records

(E) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;

Self-Study section: PROGRAM MISSION, PURPOSE AND GOALS
Data Source: Department, College and University Mission statements

(F) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;

Self-Study section: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, Degree and Certification Requirements
Data Source: Program identifies 5 programs that it believes are its peers for comparison.

(G) Program facilities and equipment;

Self-Study section: DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITIES
Data Source: Departmental Records

(H) Program finance and resources;

Self-Study section: PROGRAM BUDGET
Data Source: Departmental Records

(I) Program administration;

Self-Study section: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION
Data Source: Departmental Records

(J) Faculty Qualifications;

Self-Study section: THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY
Data Source: Departmental Records

IV. Program Review Data Elements and Sources for Self-Study

Data Element	Data Source
Faculty Profile	
1. Headcount by:	
Gender	IRPE Departmental profile
Ethnicity	IRPE Departmental profile
Full-time/part time status	IRPE Departmental profile
Visiting	Departmental Records
Tenure status	IRPE Departmental profile
Graduate faculty status	Graduate School
2. Average age by rank	IRPE Departmental profile

(Program Review Data Elements and Sources for Self-Study, continued)

Data Element	Data Source
Faculty Profile	
1. Headcount by:	
Gender	IRPE Departmental profile
Ethnicity	IRPE Departmental profile
Full-time/part time status	IRPE Departmental profile
Visiting	Departmental Records
Tenure status	IRPE Departmental profile
Graduate faculty status	Graduate School
2. Average age by rank	IRPE Departmental profile
3. Average salary by rank	IRPE Departmental profile
4. Number of new faculty hired	Departmental Records
5. Number of faculty departures	Departmental Records
6. History of use of GTAs as classroom instructors	Headcount in Dept. Profile; list of classes taught in Faculty Workload Summary
7. Teaching load credit history	Faculty Workload Reports
8. Results of student evaluations	Departmental Records
9. Number of doctoral program core faculty in the prior year	18 Characteristics Report
10. Doctoral program core faculty publications: Three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries file/patents issued per core faculty member	18 Characteristics Report
11. Doctoral program core faculty teaching load: Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty	18 Characteristics Report for doctoral programs only
12. Faculty Diversity: Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender	18 Characteristics Report for doctoral programs only
13. Doctoral program core faculty external grants: Three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external funds per faculty, and total external funds per program	18 Characteristics Report -- doctoral programs only
Program Productivity	
1. Semester credit hours	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
2. Student/teacher ratios	IRPE Departmental profile
Doctoral student-core faculty ratio: Rolling	18 Characteristics Report

(Program Review Data Elements and Sources for Self-Study, Program Productivity, continued)

3-year average FTE doctoral students/rolling 3-year average FTE core faculty	
3. Number of degrees/certificates granted (reported separately for undergraduates, master's, doctoral and certificate students)	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
Student Profile (7-year history)	
1. Headcount enrollment in each degree program by:	
Ethnicity	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
Full-time/part-time status	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
Citizenship	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
Source (Metroplex, North Texas, Texas, out-of state, International)	Residency by College in Fact Book; Departmental Records for program-specific information
Doctoral student diversity by ethnicity and gender during the prior year	18 Characteristics Report-- doctoral programs only
Percentage of full-time doctoral students: FTS/number of students enrolled for last three fall semesters	18 Characteristics Report-- doctoral programs only
2. Average age	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
3. Average standardized test scores	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
Student Financial Support	
1. Percent receiving financial support	Office of Financial Aid
Average level of support provided	Office of Financial Aid
2. For assistantships, provide measures of the percentage support provided	Departmental Records
3. History of funding for student support	Departmental Records
4. Principal sources of support (loans, scholarships, fellowships, research grants and contracts, etc.)	Office of Financial Aid
5. Number of research and teaching assistantships supported by the program for the past seven years	Departmental Records
6. Average institutional financial support provided to full time doctoral students: For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not included tuition or benefits)	18 Characteristics Report --doctoral programs only
7. Percentage full-time doctoral students with institutional financial support in the prior year of at least \$1000 of annually	18 Characteristics Report --doctoral programs only

(Program Review Data Elements and Sources for Self-Study, continued)

Student Performance, Success Completion, Retention and Attrition Rates	
1. Distribution of grades in courses (separately for undergraduate and graduate students)	Contact IRPE for access to report
2. 1-Year Retention rates for first-time, full-time freshmen	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
3. Bachelor's degree completion rate	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
4. Average time to degree for Bachelor's degrees	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
5. Master's retention rate	IRPE Master's Completion-Retention Triangles
6. Master's degree completion rates	IRPE Master's Completion-Retention Triangles
7. Average time to degree for Master's degrees	IRPE Departmental & Program Profiles
8. Comparison of master's student completion and retention rates and time to degree to national or professional norms (if available)	Program selects 5 peer programs for comparison
9. Doctoral degree retention rate	IRPE Doctoral Completion-Retention Triangle report*
10. Doctoral degree completion rate	IRPE Doctoral Completion-Retention Triangle report*
11. Rolling 3-yr average of percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within 10-years.	18 Characteristics Report
12. Rolling 3-yr average time to degree for Doctoral degrees	18 Characteristics Report
13. Comparison of doctoral student completion and retention rates and time to degree to national or professional norms (if available)	IRPE Doctoral Completion-Retention Triangle report*
14. Student Publications/Presentations: Three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE	Eventually will be available in 18 Characteristics Report; currently must be gathered by program
15. Master's and doctoral graduate student licensure rates (if applicable)	Departmental Records
16. Destination of bachelor and master's students after graduation (e.g., employment, further education)	Alumni Office; Departmental Records
17. Doctoral Student Employment Profile: Number and percent of the last three years of doctoral graduates employed, still seeking employment and unknown	18 Characteristics Report for doctoral graduates

V. SELF-STUDY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (5-7 pages maximum).

- A. 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 the Self-Study. The following outline may be followed to organize an Executive Summary. It follows the suggested outline of the Self-Study closely.
- B. Sample Template for an Executive Summary of a Self-Study

Executive Summary

**SELF-STUDY
of
DEPARTMENT OF _____
Date**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Department Administration**
 - A. Administrative Chain
 - B. Organizational Structure
- II. Department Mission, Purpose, and Goals**
 - A. Department Mission Statement
- III. The Department's Faculty**
 - A. Faculty Profile
- IV. The Department's Students**
 - A. Student Profile
- V. The Support Staff**
- VI. Description of Facilities**
 - A. Teaching or Related Facilities
 - B. Specialized Facilities
 - C. Research Facilities
- VII. The Department Budget**
 - A. Teaching Budget
 - B. Research Budget
- VIII. Evaluation on the State of the Department**
 - A. Overview
 - B. Directions for the Future

VI. PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM FINAL REPORT TEMPLATE

The Program Review Teams report consists of an Executive Summary and the full report. The following provides some general guidelines for writing these documents.

A. Executive Summary (1-2 pages maximum).

The Executive Summary should provide an overview of the Program Review Evaluation report's major findings and identify key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The following outline may be used to structure the elements of the Executive Summary.

- a. General Observations
- b. Program Strengths
- c. Areas of Concern
- d. Opportunities and threats
- e. Recommendations

B. Program Review Evaluation

This report will contain the Program Review Team's detailed findings, evaluations and recommendations. Recommendations should be prioritized in order of importance. The following may serve as a template for writing the Program Review Evaluation.

- a. Curriculum
 - i. Consistency with the academic philosophy of the field
 - ii. Consistency with the needs and goals of the related professions
 - iii. Structural arrangements
 - iv. Balance between breadth and depth
 - v. Distinction between graduate and undergraduate levels
 - vi. Degree of rigor at both levels
 - vii. Areas of concern
 - viii. Recommendations
- b. Faculty
 - i. Quality of teaching and advising
 - ii. Scholarly productivity, research, and funding
 - iii. Service to the field
 - iv. Faculty/student ratios and FTE ratios
 - v. Morale
 - vi. Areas of concern
 - vii. Recommendations
- c. Students
 - i. Quality
 - ii. Performance and Success
 - iii. Retention and degree completion (especially at doctoral level)
 - iv. Opportunities/placement
 - v. Morale, attitude toward faculty/university
 - vi. Areas of concern
 - vii. Recommendations

- d. Administrative Structure
 - i. Appropriateness of size
 - ii. Effectiveness
 - iii. Support staff
 - iv. Facilities/laboratories
 - v. Recommendations

THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON: RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE AND PROGRAM REVIEW TEAMS

A. THE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC):

- a. Reports to the Provost and is charged with overseeing the periodic (every 7 years) review process of all academic undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and centers within the University to assure its efficacy and consistency from program to program.
- b. Minimum Membership of PRC (4 faculty and 3 administrators):
 - i. Faculty member selected by the Undergraduate Assembly
 - ii. Faculty member selected by the Graduate Assembly
 - iii. Faculty member selected by Faculty Senate
 - iv. Faculty member selected by Faculty Senate
 - v. Faculty member or administrator selected by the Graduate School Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula
 - vi. Faculty member or administrator selected by the Graduate School Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula
 - vii. Faculty member or administrator selected by the Graduate School Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula

If more than 3 programs are scheduled for review in a given year, additional faculty members, with vote, will be selected by the PRC Chair, for that year only, to insure at least two members of the PRC will be assigned to each program being reviewed.

- c. The PRC is responsible for resolving any issues of academic program definition (see definition at end of this section).
- d. The PRC maintains a multi-year master schedule of program reviews, which is updated annually by the PRC for presentation to the Provost.
- e. The PRC's permanent chair is currently the Associate Dean of the Office of Graduate Studies. PRC members serve 3-year staggered terms and may be re-elected).

B. THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM (PRT): The PRT is an ad-hoc team responsible for the review process of their assigned program. The PRT Chair, supported by other members of the PRT, is responsible for the management process of their assigned Program Review. One PRT is assigned to each unit undergoing Program Review by the PRC Chair.

- a. General Responsibilities of the PRT encompass the following :
 - i. Facilitate, coordinate and oversee a unit's Program Review;
 - ii. Advise the program and external members of the PRT on program review policies and practices;
 - iii. Assist in assuring consistency of process and standards;
 - iv. Periodically reports to the PRC the progress of the program review;
 - v. Recommend and elect a PRT Chair from among UT Arlington members of the PRT.
- b. Members of the PRT consist of the following individuals:

- i. One PRC member not affiliated with the program under review to serve as a voting member of the PRT (appointed by the PRC Chair);
 - ii. At least 1 additional UT Arlington faculty member not affiliated with the program under review to serve as a voting member (selected by the PRC);
 - iii. Two external reviewers not affiliated with the program being reviewed;
 - iv. Other non-voting members added by the Provost to each PRT when appropriate.
- c. The PRT Chair performs the following duties:
- i. Serves as a liaison between the PRC and the PRT;
 - ii. Manages the review process and site-visit;
 - iii. Verifies that all arrangements have been made for each external reviewer's visit;
 - iv. Based on recommendations from the unit, contacts and secures agreement of external reviewers to serve on the PRT;
 - v. Establishes the schedule for the site-visit;
 - vi. Distributes the self-study prepared by unit;
 - vii. Coordinates preparation and distribution of the final report during/after the site-visit.
- d. Selection of External Reviewers to serve on the PRT:
- i. The success of Program Review critically depends upon the expertise and insights of selected External Reviewers. Their task is to provide recommendations for actions that will add to the program's strengths and enable it to address critical challenges. Therefore external reviewers should
 - be acknowledged experts in a discipline that is directly related to that of the program undergoing review.
 - be tenured and have an understanding of both the academic and administrative aspects of programs similar to the program undergoing review.
 - be employed at other institutions with reputations and profiles that match or exceed those of UT Arlington/
 - be active in a program similar to that of the unit under review that has a reputation which matches or exceeds it.
 - not be affiliated with UTA. They should not be past employees, students, or colleagues engaged in on-going collaborative work.
 - not be drawn from programs from the local area that compete directly with the program under review for students or other resources.

The affected unit's administration will provide an un-prioritized list of individuals (approximately five in number) to their PRT with a brief written explanation of how each individual satisfies the above criteria. In most cases two of these individuals will be selected and contacted by the PRT Chair to serve on the PRT. If less than the desired numbers of potential external reviewers agree to serve, the Program administration will be asked to suggest additional qualified individuals.

- ii. The PRT Chair is responsible for contacting the external reviewers, setting up the tentative travel times, and communicating this information to the Office of the Provost via Penny Driessner.

- iii. Formal appointment letters will be provided by the Provost's Office. Provide Penny Driessner with the external reviewers' contact information.
- iv. The Department being reviewed is responsible for arranging transportation, lodging, reimbursements for meals, and other administrative matters associated with the PRT's activities.

C. REVIEW PROCEDURE:

- a. The Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula will notify program to be reviewed at least one year in advance.
- b. The program faculty and academic leadership will prepare a comprehensive self-study and executive summary in accordance with the "General Guidelines for Preparation of a Unit Self-Study." The unit's administration is responsible for providing copies of their self-study, executive summary and appendices to the Chair of their PRT and their Academic Dean. The PRT Chair will distribute copies of the reports to members of their review team and the Chair of the PRC.
- c. The PRT Chair will distribute copies of the self-study and its executive summary along with the PRT's final report and executive summary to the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, and Academic Dean.
- d. The Chair of the PRT will consult with the administration of the academic unit under review, Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and members of the PRT, including the external members, to set the date for the two-day site-visit. Visits should be scheduled for Monday and Tuesday (with arrival Sunday) or Thursday and Friday (with arrival on Wednesday).
- e. The PRT Chair will coordinate the site-visit schedule for each program review.
 - i. The academic leadership of the unit being reviewed will set the schedule for meetings involving students and faculty, and will provide meeting space.
 - ii. The PRT Chair, in consultation with the academic leadership of the unit being reviewed, arrange confirmed meeting times for the PRT to receive the Charge from the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, meet with the Academic Dean, and hold an exit interview with the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and Academic Dean.
 - iii. The schedule must be completed and distributed to PRC Chair, PRT members, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, and Academic Dean at least four weeks before the intended date of the visit of the external reviewers to campus.
- f. Key elements of the site-visit schedule: The site-visit schedule will normally include the following events:
 - i. A meeting of the PRT with the Graduate Dean to receive the Charge to the Team;
 - ii. Meetings of the PRT with the unit's academic leadership (dean, chair, etc.), faculty, staff, students, and alumni as deemed necessary by the PRT to clarify information contained in the self-study;
 - iii. A tour of major teaching and research facilities where appropriate;

- iv. A meeting of the PRT to determine if additional information from the academic leadership is needed;
- v. Time for the PRT to deliberate, draw conclusions, and begin writing a draft report (ideally, the initial draft should be completed before reviewers leave campus);
- vi. An exit meeting, attended by the PRT, the Department Chair and other unit administrators, faculty, students, and the Academic Dean to provide the PRT's preliminary assessment of the goals, plans, staffing, resources, strengths, and opportunities for improvements of the unit (agenda and presenters determined by the PRT);
- vii. A second exit meeting where the PRT summarizes immediate impressions and provides a preview of its final written report to Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, Academic Dean, PRC Chair, and other appropriate senior administrators.

D. FINAL REPORT OF THE PRT:

External members of the PRT will prepare the formal written final report of the PRT. They will also provide a 1-2 page executive summary of their report. UTA members of the PRT will assist their efforts as required.

- a. The Final Report and executive summary are due no later than January 15 when site-visits are conducted during the Fall Semester.
- b. The Final Report and executive summary should be sent to the Chair of the PRT who will distribute them.
- c. At the discretion of the PRT, a draft of the Final Report may be provided to the program under review for factual correction only. The PRT will decide whether to accept or reject such corrections before submitting the final copy of the Final Report.
- d. The PRT Chair will distribute the final copy of the Final Report and executive summary electronically to the Program Chair, Academic Dean, Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, and PRC Chair.
- e. The PRT's formal Final Report will:
 - i. contain an executive summary
 - ii. address any unique aspects of its charge;
 - iii. assess the unit's overall performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
 - iv. identify specific strengths and opportunities for improvements;
 - v. make recommendations for any changes the PRT believes advisable (these recommendations should be ranked in order of importance);
 - vi. refer to the program's self-study and note items of agreement and disagreement between the PRT's assessment and those of the self-study;
 - vii. typically consider the undergraduate and graduate curricula and programs of instruction, the student demand for these programs, the scholarly activity of the unit's faculty, the unit's facilities, the national stature and impact of the unit's undergraduate and graduate programs (where appropriate), the quality of its students, the market for its graduates, the level of support for the unit, the effectiveness of its leadership, and its effectiveness in furthering the university's affirmative action/equal opportunity goals.

- f. The Executive Summary of the Final Report should
 - i. accompany the full Final Report as a separate document;
 - ii. be 1-2 pages in length and summarize key findings and prioritized recommendations.

E. FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT BY THE PROGRAM UNDER REVIEW:

- a. The unit's chief administrative officer will provide a written response prepared in consultation with the unit's faculty members giving specific actions planned in light of the report's recommendations. Where the unit disagrees with the findings or recommendations of the PRT report, the basis for such disagreement will be given. This response will be sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula in mid-February.
- b. In the Spring Semester following completion of the PRT's review, the Provost will discuss the PRT's report and the unit's response with the unit's administration and faculty, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, and Academic Dean.
- c. The Provost will charge the academic unit with developing, in consultation with the program's academic dean, a concise strategic plan and an assessment plan that addresses the review's most significant issues. The assessment plan will include administrative and student learning outcomes specific to issues or questions discovered through the program review process that will be incorporated into next bi-annual Unit Effectiveness Process (UEP) cycle. In cases where multiple outcomes are developed, the department may decide to schedule the assessments across multiple UEP cycles. Please see the UEP Assessment Handbook for further information on incorporating these outcomes into the bi-annual UEP cycle.
- d. The unit's self-study, the PRT's final report and executive summary, the unit's response, and the resulting concise strategic plan and assessment plan will constitute the official record of the program review.

VII. Compensation, Travel and Meal Arrangements during Site-Visit

Because of the large number of program reviews conducted each year and to insure that the site-visits progress smoothly, it is important that the following procedures be followed:

- a) As soon as possible, the PRT Chair (or each external reviewer) should e-mail the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed the name, address, phone number, title, employer, and social security number of each external reviewer. If the external reviewer is employed in the UT System, she or he must also supply a letter granting permission to engage in outside employment, signed by their Department Chair, Academic Dean, or other appropriate administrator.
- b) The PRT Chair should inform the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed of the program review dates so that she can make travel and hotel arrangements for the external reviewers. She will book the flight arrival for the day prior to the beginning of the review, book a 6:00 pm or later departure on the day that

the review ends and make hotel reservations. UT Arlington has negotiated rates (\$85 per night) at the Hilton/Arlington (817)640-3322 and at the Sheraton/Arlington (817)261-8200. Every possible attempt should be made to book hotel reservations at one of these two hotels. In general, the external reviewers are not expected to incur any expenses during their visit. Airfare and hotel expenses are directly billed to UT Arlington and will be paid for by UT Arlington with the exception of any personal hotel expenses incurred (phone calls, movies, etc). The external reviewer will be responsible for such personal expenses and should pay the hotel directly. Paid parking at the reviewer's home airport will be the responsibility of the reviewer.

- c) Meals (lunches, dinners, and breakfast if desired) during the external reviewers' visit should be hosted by an UT Arlington faculty member, paid for by a UT Arlington faculty member, and the receipt submitted to the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed for reimbursement. The external reviewers should not pay for any meals while at UTA. It is common practice for at least one of the UT Arlington members of the PRT and/or faculty from the program under review to join the external reviewers at these meals. It is expected that the UT Arlington host will select a reasonably priced restaurant, and limit the number of UT Arlington personnel to no more than three.
- d) External reviewers should be taken to the office of the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed at the beginning of their visit to sign necessary paperwork and to verify their correct mailing address. The external reviewers should also bring their driver's licenses so copies can be made for identification.
- e) Each external reviewer will be paid an honorarium of \$1,000 per day for the two days they are on campus (maximum of \$2,000) and are expected to write a final report summarizing the findings of the review. If two external reviewers are used, they may work together and submit one report to the PRT Chair.
- f) The PRT Chair should be the primary contact for the external reviewers

VIII. Draft Site-Visit Schedule
(Responsible Party: PRT Chair)

PROGRAM BEING REVIEWED: _____

DATES OF SITE-VISIT: _____

Program Review Team:

	Name	University	Department	E-mail address
1.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____

UT Arlington PRT Members cell phone (if available):

	Name	Cell Phone Number
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____

DAY 1:

External reviewers arrive at D/FW airport and are picked up by program faculty or PRT member and taken to hotel and out to eat if appropriate.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER 1: _____

Pick up from airport: _____

Flight: _____ Airline: _____ Terminal: _____ Time: _____

Hotel: _____ Address: _____

Dinner host: _____

EXTERNAL REVIEWER 2: _____

Pick up from airport: _____

Flight: _____ Airline: _____ Terminal: _____ Time: _____

Hotel: _____ Address: _____

Dinner host: _____

DAY 2:

8:15 – 9:00 Pick up both external reviewers from hotel and take to 9:00 meeting

Host: _____

9:00 – 9:45 **PRT meets Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and PRC Chair** to receive formal charge from the Provost, preliminary discussions of the review process and site visit issues. *Contact Dean as early as possible to schedule this appointment.*

ROOM: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

9:45 – 10:00 Visit Administrative Assistant of the program being reviewed for signing paperwork

10:10 – 11:00 **PRT meets with Academic Dean of the program being reviewed.** *Contact Dean as early as possible to schedule this appointment.*

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

11:00 – 12:00 PRT meets with **Chair** of the program being reviewed

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

12:00 – 1:30 Lunch at _____

Attended by: usually External PRT, 1-2 Local PRT, and 1 Program Faculty

Host: PRT Chair/Program Faculty

1:30 – 5:00 PRT meets with **Program Faculty, Students** (see Note below)

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

5:00 – 5:15 If necessary, PRT meets with Academic leadership (Dean, Chair, etc) to continue discussions of site-visit issues, and request additional information, meetings, etc. for the following day.

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

5:30 External Reviewers taken to Dinner

Host: PRT members/ Program Faculty

After Dinner External Reviewers taken back to Hotel

Host: Program Faculty or PRT

DAY 3:

8:15 - 8:45 Pick up both external reviewers from hotel and take to 8:45 meeting

Host: _____

8:45 – 10:30 PRT meets with **Program Faculty, Students** (see Note below)

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

10:30 – 11:15 PRT provided a **tour of teaching/research facilities**

ROOM: _____ Building: _____

Host: Program administrator/faculty

11:15 – 12:00 PRT meets with **Program Faculty, Staff or Alumni**

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

12:00 – 1:30 Lunch at _____

Attended by: usually External PRT, 1-2 Local PRT, and 1 Program Faculty

Host: PRT Chair

1:30 – 2:30 PRT meets to prepare for two exit interviews, which should include:

- a) Immediate impressions
- b) Preliminary assessment of goals, plans, staffing, resources, strengths, and areas for improvement
- c) Forecast of expected completion date for PRT's final report

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

2:30 – 3:30 EXIT INTERVIEW ONE

Attendance: **PRT, Academic Dean, Department Chair, Faculty**, (Students may be included in this exit interview if desired by Chair and Dean) *Contact Dean as early as possible to determine his or her possible participation and to schedule the appointment.*

Room: _____ Building: _____-

Host: PRT Chair

3:40 – 4:30 EXIT INTERVIEW TWO

Attendance: **PRT, Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, Academic Dean, PRC Chair**. *Contact participants as early as possible to schedule this appointment.*

Room: _____ Building: _____

Host: PRT Chair

4:30 PRT meets to discuss the Final Report related issues, and take external reviewers to D/FW Airport

EXTERNAL REVIEWER 1: _____

Take to airport: _____

Flight: _____ Airline: _____ Terminal: _____ Time: _____

EXTERNAL REVIEWER 2: _____

Take to airport: _____

Flight: _____ Airline: _____ Terminal: _____ Time: _____

Note: This schedule may be modified to accommodate particular needs of the Program, PRT, Deans and Provost. Make sure that all have the opportunity to provide input when determining with whom to meet, when to meet, and how long the meeting should be. For example, the PRT may want to meet with undergraduate and graduate students separately, meet with individual faculty, hold longer meetings with some, shorter meetings with others, etc. These desires should be accommodated and the schedule adjusted accordingly.

X. Program Review Committee Management Schedule

The master schedule of program reviews is maintained by the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and is available upon request.

A. Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula

Fall Semester (1-year prior to site visit semester):

- a. Notify Graduate Assembly, Undergraduate Assembly, and the Faculty Senate to select new PRC members to serve three-year terms, replacing those whose terms expire.
- b. Appoint new administrators to the PRC to replace those whose terms expire.
- c. Obtain a list from each Dean/Director of faculty/administrators willing to serve on one of the PRTs. The number requested should be approximately twice the number needed in order to allow for conflicts. Share list with PRC Chair.
- d. Provide new members examples of previous self-studies if requested.

Fall Semester (site visit semester):

- a. Present the Provost's Charge to the PRT and discuss process.
- b. Participate in the exit interview with Provost and PRC Chair.
- c. If needed, assist PRT Chair in securing final report of the external reviewers.
- d. Distributes final report to program Chair, Provost and Academic Dean and charges program to submit a written formal response to the report.

Spring Semester following site visit:

- a. Review final report of the external reviewers and response of the unit under review.
- b. Participate in discussion between program, Provost and Academic Dean regarding review, program's formal response to the review and strategic next steps.
- c. Collects institutional response to the external review.
- d. No later than 90 days after the completion of each review, submit electronically via IRPE a report of the outcome of the review to THECB Academic Affairs and Research Division. This report must include a summary of the programmatic self-study and the full text of the external reviewers' evaluation as well as the institutional response to the external evaluation

B. UT Arlington PRC Chair

Spring Semester Prior to Site-Visit

- a. Use list of additional faculty/administrators to serve on PRTs obtained by the Graduate School Dean and the standing PRC to assemble the committee roster which will ensure each PRT will have at least two members from UTA.
- b. Call PRC meeting within first month of the semester to review process, create teams, and assign teams to programs.
- c. Have each team identify a PRT Chair.
- d. Verify that PRTs have secured services of two external reviewers at least six weeks prior to the end of the semester.

- e. Verify proposed schedule meets requirements described in this manual.
- f. Monitor progress of self-study, and verify that schedule and self-study have been properly distributed.
- g. Assure travel arrangements have been finalized.

Fall Semester (site visit semester):

- a. Participate in meeting to charge the PRT and in the exit interview. Provide other assistance to the PRT as may be required.
- b. Monitor progress on the PRT's final report. Support PRT Chair as needed.

C. UT Arlington PRT Chair

Spring Semester Prior to the site visit:

- a. Meet with program chair and other UT Arlington member of the PRT for introductions and to begin process of identifying four candidates unaffiliated with UT Arlington to serve as external reviewers.
- b. Meet with program chair to identify at least two possible dates for an on campus visit by external reviewers. Determine if the Academic Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and Provost are available on these dates and revise as needed.
- c. From list of identified external reviewers, contact no more than two of them at a time to determine interest in participating in the program review on one of the two proposed dates.
- d. Continue working through list of candidates until two reviewers have agreed to participate and supply the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed with contact information.
- e. Finalize schedule of the site-visit using the template provided in this Manual. Program chair should schedule meetings with faculty, students, and staff and arrange meeting rooms. PRT chair should schedule meetings with Deans and Provost after contacting their offices to obtain available times.
- f. Program chair should send completed Self-Study Report with all relevant appendices to the PRT Chair who will arrange to send the document, Site-Visit Schedule and any other needed material to external reviewers and the PRC Chair. All documents must be received by the external reviewers no less than four weeks before the scheduled visit begins.

Fall Semester (site visit semester):

- a. Four weeks prior to the scheduled visit confirm external reviewer's have received all documents and their schedules.
- b. One week prior to visit, confirm schedule with program chair, Deans, and Provost.
- c. The PRT Chair will coordinate and maintain the schedule during the external reviewer's visit. At least one UT Arlington PRT member should accompany the external reviewers at all meetings.
- d. The PRT Chair must fix a date by which the external reviewers will complete their final report. This date should be prior to the close of Fall term.
- e. If a signed coversheet is required, the PRT Chair should provide a copy for signatures prior to the departure of the external reviewers.

- f. The PRT Chair should ask the external reviewers if they wish to submit a draft to the program for factual correction prior to final submission. If the answer is affirmative, the draft should be sent to the PRT Chair who will distribute it to the program Chair. After correction, the PRT Chair will return the draft to reviewers for their review. After the external reviewers have made any corrections they feel necessary, they should submit the final report to the PRT Chair. If factual correction of a draft is not desired, or if no errors are found after examination for errors, the PRT Chair may submit the report as the final document to the Provost, Graduate School and the program's Academic Deans, and chair of the PRC.

After the Site-visit is Completed:

- a. The PRT will be available to assist the external members of the team as they write their Final Report.
- b. The PRT Chair will follow-up as necessary to assure the Final Report of the external members is submitted by the due date.

XI. General Outline of the Timeline for Tasks Performed by the PRT

	Timeline	Program Review Team Tasks
<i>approx.</i>	<i>Spring semester</i>	Begin Departmental Self-Study (Dept. Chairs, and faculty)
<i>approx.</i>	<i>February</i>	Program Review Teams appointed (PRC Chair)
<i>approx.</i>	<i>By end of February</i>	UT Arlington members of PRT select chair and inform PRC Chair of choice
<i>approx.</i>	<i>March</i>	PRT meets with program and identifies potential external reviewers
<i>during</i>	<i>March-April</i>	PRT Chair contacts external reviewers, describes process, travel arrangements, compensation, etc. and supplies each copy of the Program Review Manual
<i>during</i>	<i>April</i>	PRT Chair assures that external reviewer contact information has been received by the Administrative Assistant in the department being reviewed.
<i>during</i>	<i>April-May</i>	PRT finalizes specific dates for on-site review and visitation schedule (daily itinerary), coordinating with programs, Provost Office, Academic Deans, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula and external reviewers. Finalizing itinerary may require delay into the summer, but must be complete before August 1.
<i>approx.</i>	<i>May</i>	Finalized schedule of PRT review provided to Programs, Provost's office, Academic Deans, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, PRC Chair and external members of the PRT
<i>prior to</i>	<i>At least 5 weeks prior to the date of the scheduled site visit</i>	Complete Departmental Self-Study Document. Program provides ten copies to PRT chair.
<i>prior to</i>	<i>At least one month prior to the date of the scheduled site visit</i>	PRT chair distributes copies of Self-study PRT team members, PRC Chair, Academic Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula. Remaining copies will be submitted to Provost with final report of the PRT
<i>approx..</i>	<i>During the first 8 weeks of fall semester</i>	Conduct on-site program reviews
<i>prior to</i>	<i>December 15</i>	Program Review Final Report Submitted to PRT chair and forwarded to Program Chairs for review factual error correction and comment
<i>due no later than</i>	<i>January 15</i>	Executive summary and complete Final Report of the PRT with corrections sent to Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula to distribute to Provost, Academic Dean, and Program Chair. Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula charges Chair with writing response.
<i>due no later than</i>	<i>February 15</i>	Program Chair produces a response to the Final Report of the PRT and submits it to Provost.
<i>During</i>	<i>February 15- April</i>	Provost meets with Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Curricula, Academic Dean Program Chair and faculty to discuss PRT report and program's response.
<i>During</i>	<i>March 15- first week of April</i>	Provost's Office prepares institutional response to external review.
<i>Prior to</i>	<i>April 7 (or 90 days after external reviewer reports are due)</i>	IRPE submits reports to THECB.

APPENDIX 1

Academic Program Review Assessment Data Template and Guide

The purpose of the Assessment of Student Outcomes section (Subsection D, p. 10) of the Academic Program Review self-study is for the department to describe what has been learned about student achievement through the process of assessing student learning outcomes since the last program review and how the department has used this information to guide changes to curriculum and services. This section of the program review self-study should include, but is not limited to information gleaned from the Unit Effectiveness Process (UEP).

Careful reporting and analysis of how student outcome assessments are conducted and used to guide program change are clearly important parts of a program's self-analysis. This work takes on additional significance, however, because SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) will review and evaluate it as part of the University's accreditation process.

Thus it must be presented in a manner that provides the information they require.

This template and guide is intended to serve two functions; 1) to offer a suggested template for presenting student learning outcome assessment information within the Academic Program Review self-study, and 2) to provide guiding questions to consider when preparing the description of student learning outcome assessment information.

In order to describe the meaning of assessment results and subsequent improvements, it is necessary to contextualize the discussion by summarizing the outcomes that were assessed since the last APR; how the outcomes were assessed; and the results of the assessments. This can be done in narrative fashion, but departments may find it useful to put this information in a table such as the one below.

Intended Student Learning Outcome	Method of Assessment	Criterion for Success	Results of Assessment (Achieved; Partially achieved; Unachieved)
Sample 1: Graduates of the Latin Language minor option will demonstrate their ability to analyze the grammatical construction of unedited Classical Latin.	A test that includes the identification and grammatical explanation of Latin words and constructions in context.	A successful outcome will be 80% of Latin Language minors successfully identifying and explaining seven of ten grammatical items.	Unachieved
Sample 2: Students completing the B.S program in Architecture will be able to explain and diagram the parti – the organizing thought or decision that informs the design and choice of approach – for the project.	Final senior studio project assessed by rubric (Research and Analysis section)	The School of Architecture intends that 70% of the students completing the B.S. program in Architecture will have received assessments of very good or exceptional for the research and analysis criteria.	Achieved
Sample 3: Students will be able to effectively communicate his/her role and purpose clearly in an interview, group, organization and/or community meeting.	Students were assessed by their field instructors during their final evaluation using the eight items in the section "Student will learn and be able to demonstrate effective communication skills."	This item was assessed using a five point Likert scale. The scale ranges from 1 "Does not meet expectations" to 5 "Greatly exceeds expectation." At least 85% of students were to be rated at a level 3 or higher.	Partially achieved

Please note the above examples are for demonstration purposes only and do not reflect actual results of assessment.

Once the above information is summarized or listed in a table, describe what the results of the assessment mean to their respective program(s). Consider the following questions:

- 1) For outcomes that were not achieved or partially achieved, what was faculty consensus on what that meant about student knowledge, skill or ability in that particular area?
- 2) What changes were made based on the results of assessment information?
- 3) Were the unachieved or partially achieved outcomes reassessed after changes were implemented? If so, what were the findings from the re-assessment? Did student learning improve?
- 4) For outcomes that were achieved, were the results expected or a surprise?
- 5) Were faculty pleased with students' level of performance for achieved outcomes or would they prefer to see the criterion of success increased for the particular outcome(s)?
- 6) Did the assessments reveal any issues with assessment methodology? If so, what changes were made to improve methodology?