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Introduction

The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) considers the periodic review of each of its academic programs essential to promote and maintain excellence in undergraduate and graduate programs (see Appendix A, Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) 2.39, Academic Program Review). Additionally, graduate program review is required by both the UT System (UT System Guidelines) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (see Appendix B, Texas Administrative Code, Rule 5.52, Review of Existing Degree Programs).

Academic program review is a comprehensive process, in which academic units engage in a methodical evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of their degree programs; determine the degree to which departmental strategic goals and objectives are aligned with those of the college and the University; and summarize the assessment of educational outcomes.

As a result of a thorough review, academic units can realize several benefits, such as:
- the clarification of program goals, strengths, and weaknesses;
- the evaluation of the quality of the unit’s academic programs;
- the review and possible revision of objectives for the teaching, research and service missions of the academic program for future attainment of the University, college and departmental strategic goals; and
- development of a source of information to guide decisions on future priorities and available resources.


Overview of the Review Process

The preparation of materials for a program review should be an inclusive process, involving all faculty to the extent possible. The program review process is comprised of the following steps:

1. External reviewers are selected and a site visit is arranged.
2. The department prepares and obtains approval of the program review packet (i.e., Internal Program Review).
3. The external review team visits the campus and afterward submits the External Review Report (Report) to the Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment.
4. The program and Graduate Council (where applicable) prepare responses to the Report.
5. The Provost, College Dean, and Department Chair meet to review the Report and the various responses to it.
6. The College Dean and the Provost provide the Institutional Response to the Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment.
7. A follow-up meeting is held one year after the review to monitor the department’s progress in responding to the external review.

External reviewer site visits will be held during fall and spring semesters. A program review timeline is provided in Appendices B and C.
**Program Review Packet**

The centerpiece of the review process is the department's review packet. The program review process provides an opportunity for reflection and assessment of the department’s future directions in support of the Universities continued goal to reach Tier One status.

The primary focus of the review packet is the department’s strategic plan and progress toward achieving its strategic goals in the future. The narrative should evaluate and describe the department’s contributions to the University’s vision, mission and strategic goals and contribution to implementation of the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) if applicable.

The review packet narrative is not to exceed fifteen (15) pages in length; supporting documentation provided in appendices is not included in the page count.

The department’s final review materials will be posted online for the external reviewers to access at least one month in advance of the reviewers’ visit. Printed copies of the strategic plan and the summary statement shall be sent to each reviewer at the time the materials are posted.

Guidelines for the review packet are located on pages 6-18 of this manual.
External Review Team

An external review team reviews and analyzes the department’s review packet and conducts interviews during the site visit.

The goals of the external review team include:
- assessing the appropriateness of the department’s strategic plan to contribute to the University’s continued vision of becoming a premier public research university;
- identifying strengths and weaknesses of the degree programs; and
- providing strategies for quality improvement.

External reviewers should be nationally recognized experts in the academic field; senior faculty at institutions equivalent to the University’s aspirant institutions; and have significant administrative, curricular, and program-review experience. Ideally, reviewers will be from a public Association of American Universities (AAU) institution.

- Reviewers must be from outside the state of Texas.
- Each Doctoral program must have two reviewers with demonstrable subject matter expertise.
- Each Master’s program must have one reviewer with demonstrable subject matter expertise.

The Department Chair submits external reviewer nominations, potential reviewers’ curriculum vitae, and a disclosure statement of any known affiliations between the proposed reviewers and UTSA (i.e., nature of the relationship, any potential conflicts of interest, etc.) to the College Dean.

The College Dean selects no more than three reviewers from the departmental nominees and may add up to two additional reviewers not on the department list. The College Dean should identify alternate reviewers in the event that one or more of the reviewers chosen is unable to commit to the review. Then the College Dean appoints the external review team in consultation with the Provost, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, and Department Chair, as well as the Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (if the department has undergraduate programs) and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School (if the department has graduate programs).

The College Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, designates one member of the review team to serve as the Chair (i.e., leads the review process and prepares the post-visit final report).
**Review Visit**

The external review team spends up to two days on campus discussing the review packet and related information with administrators, faculty, staff, students, and others related to the department. Required meetings include:

- an initial meeting of the Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules);
- meetings with department faculty (Department Schedules);
- meetings with undergraduate and graduate students of the department (Department Schedules);
- a meeting with the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, College Dean and Graduate Council representatives, and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules);
- unscheduled time for the review team to formulate initial recommendations (Department Schedules); and
- an exit meeting with the Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules).

The review team may, in advance of the site visit, request additional meetings with other stakeholders. A sample site visit schedule is provided in Appendix D.

A hard copy of an electronic access to all of review packet materials will be made available to the Chair of the review team during the visit.

**External Review Report**

The external review team shall prepare an External Review Report that includes a general assessment of the program (students, faculty, curriculum, etc.) that includes:

- an evaluation of the appropriateness of the department’s strategic plan to contribute to the University’s continued vision of becoming a premier public research university;
- a description of significant strengths and weaknesses, including any related to the QEP; and
- a prioritized set of recommended strategies for future improvements.

The External Review Report must address critical issues and include rationales for the strategies recommended for improvement. The External Review Report will serve as the foundation of the succeeding steps of the review process.

A template is provided, by the IE office, for the External Program Reviewers report.
Review Response

After the External Review Report is received, the department shall prepare a Department Response to address the external review team recommendations and submit that response to the College Dean. The College Dean will review the department’s response and prepare written recommendations for the Provost.

If the department reviewed offers graduate programs, the Graduate Council shall review the External Review Report. They will prepare a written response to any recommendations involving graduate studies and submit a Graduate Council Response to the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School. The Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and the College Dean will meet with the Provost to discuss the review and their respective recommendations.

For all programs, the Provost will meet with the Department Chair, the College Dean, the appropriate Vice Provost (Vice Provost/Dean for the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School), and the Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment to discuss the outcome of the review and formulate the final response. For those departments offering graduate programs, the department’s Graduate Advisor of Record will also attend this meeting. The Provost will provide a written final response to the department indicating any actions the University will take in response to the external review.

One year after issuing the final response, the Provost shall meet with the Department Chair, Graduate Advisor of Record, College Dean, and appropriate Vice Provost (Vice Provost/Dean for the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School) to review progress in responding to the external review.
Narrative Outline

The review packet narrative should focus on the department’s strategic plan, progress toward achieving its strategic goals, and summary of each degree programs leading issues. It provides an opportunity to systematically think through critical issues that influence progress toward department goals.

The narrative should follow the outline shown below and should not exceed fifteen (15) pages.

Table of Contents (not included in page count)
List of Participants and Authors (not included in page count)

Department Overview
Please extract the Mission and Vision statements from the department’s strategic plan and discuss the overall role of the department. Also, discuss the faculty characteristics for this department.

Description of Programs
Describe each undergraduate and graduate program, including the available degrees, majors, minors, and certificates.

Academic Department Objectives and Relationship to University’s Strategic Plan
Programs may support the University’s mission and strategic initiatives in various ways (e.g., undergraduate or graduate education; basic or applied research, etc.). Describe specific ways that the programs contribute to the mission of the College and the University.

Facilities and Equipment
Please describe your existing facilities and equipment.

Finances and Resources
Please discuss your department’s current financial landscape and available resources.

Organization and Administration
Please explain your department bylaws, committee structure and administration.

Strengths
Summarize the department’s assessment of the strengths of the programs reviewed. Include a discussion of the significance that these strengths have for each program in the future. The section should address the following:

- quality of the instruction, research, and service related to the program; and
- sustainability of the program with regard to enrollments, graduates, and future resources.

Weaknesses
Summarize the department’s analysis of the weaknesses of the programs reviewed. Include a discussion of the implications that these weaknesses have for each program in the future. The section should address the following:

- quality of the instruction, research, and service related to the program; and
- sustainability of the programs in relation to enrollments, graduates, and future resources.
Opportunities
Describe internal and/or external opportunities available to the department and how these opportunities can develop the programs in the future. In addition, briefly describe how pursuing these opportunities furthers the missions of the College and the University.

External Challenges
Summarize the department’s assessment of the external challenges. Include a discussion of the implications that these challenges present to each program moving forward.

Aspirant Departments
Using the information identified in Table 1 of the review packet, summarize how the program compares to its aspirant programs and steps being taken to emulate these model departments (e.g., degrees offered, number of faculty, number of undergraduates, number of master’s students, number of doctoral students, degrees awarded, etc.). Also, discuss any notable differences in program curriculum and duration in comparison to these peer programs.

Future Plans
Briefly describe the department’s plans for the next five years. The discussion should be organized by the following categories:

- internal improvements that are possible using existing resources,
- improvements that may require additional resources, and
- a description of how the formation of collaborations can improve program quality.
SharePoint Overview

From the Academic Program Review SharePoint site, click on the button for “APR Workspace” for the applicable college. Then, click on the applicable review year. You will see two folders:

1) **Completed Forms folder:**
   Upload completed forms related to the visit here.

2) **UTSA (department name) Review Packet folder:**
   This is the folder that will contain the entire review packet that will be provided to external reviewers. Items to be uploaded here include:

   **Assessment folder**
   
   Undergraduate TracDat reports – provided by IE Office
   Graduate TracDat reports – provided by IE Office

   **Faculty Qualifications folder**
   
   Faculty Roster (Table 2) – provided by IE Office
   Faculty Population (Table 3) – provided by IE Office
   Curriculum Vitae for all continuing faculty

   **Program Enrollment Information folder**
   
   Undergraduate
   
   Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 7) – provided by IE Office
   New Undergraduate Student High School Rank (Table 8) – provided by IE Office
   Key Measures (Table 9) – provided by IE Office

   Masters
   
   Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 10) – provided by IE Office
   Key Measures (Table 11) – provided by IE Office
   Faculty Teaching Load (Table 12) – provided by IE Office
   Student Publications and Awards
   Graduate Placement (i.e., employment or further education/training)
   Graduate Licensure Rates (if applicable)

   Doctoral
   
   Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 13) – provided by IE Office
   Key Measures (Table 14) – provided by IE Office
   Student Publications and Awards
   Graduate Placement (i.e., employment or further education/training)
   Graduate Licensure Rates (if applicable)

   **Program Syllabi folder**
   
   Course Syllabi – one example per course
SharePoint Overview - Continued

Research Productivity folder

Research /Creative Productivity (Table 4)
Faculty Publications (Table 5)
Faculty External Grants (Table 6)

Strategic Plan & Program Overview folder

Strategic Plan
Aspirant Programs (Table 1)

Narrative Self-Report (see outline on pages 6-7)
To access the Academic Program Review SharePoint website, visit our Academic Program Review SharePoint site:

**Academic Program Review: Pre-Visit**

First step of review process requires action within 30-60 days after email notification. Sample Forms are located in the [Pre-Visit](#) box.

**Academic Program Review: On-Site Visit**

Action required within 30 days of review. Sample Forms are located in the [Site Visit](#) box.

**Academic Program Review: Post-Visit**

Forms needed after Program Review has finalized. Sample Forms are located in the [Post-Visit](#) box.

**Academic Program Review: Resources**

General information, additional guidance, and other reference materials. Sample Information - Located in the [Resource](#) box.

**Academic Program Review: Schedules**

Lists the Program Review Schedule and the Academic Project Calendar for current and upcoming program reviews. Additional information located in the [Schedules](#) box.
## Table 1 – Aspirant Programs – Information from Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirant Programs</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>AY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Peers</td>
<td>List Degrees Offered</td>
<td># of T/TT Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA Program *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant Department 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant Department 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant Department 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant Department 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please refer to data provided by OIR to populate this row.

## Faculty Qualifications

## Table 2 – Faculty Roster – Information from Department. Also available in Digital Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Roster</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Discipline Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 3 – Faculty Population – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Population</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (n/%)</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (n/%)</th>
<th>Fall 2015 (n/%)</th>
<th>Fall 2016 (n/%)</th>
<th>Fall 2017 (n/%)</th>
<th>5-year Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4 - Research /Creative Productivity Data – Information from Department. Available in Digital Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Type (e.g., Tier 1 Journal, etc.)</th>
<th># AY 2013</th>
<th># AY 2014</th>
<th># AY 2015</th>
<th># AY 2016</th>
<th># AY 2017</th>
<th>Five Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 5 - Faculty publications – Information from Department. Available in Digital Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th># AY 2013</th>
<th># AY 2014</th>
<th># AY 2015</th>
<th># AY 2016</th>
<th># AY 2017</th>
<th>Five Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 6 - Faculty external grants – Information from [http://research.utsa.edu/dashboard](http://research.utsa.edu/dashboard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty External Grants</th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
<th>AY 2016</th>
<th>AY 2017</th>
<th>5 -year Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research Total ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funding Proposals Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Dollar Amount Requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Faculty Holding Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Research Expenditures /Faculty ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Invention Disclosures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: If the department has more than one undergraduate degree program, fill out a separate Undergraduate Program Enrollment Information page for each.

Table 7 – Undergraduate Student Enrollment and Demographics – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Student enrollment and Student demographics</th>
<th>Fall 2013 Dept</th>
<th>UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2014 Dept</th>
<th>UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2015 Dept</th>
<th>UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2016 Dept</th>
<th>UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2017 Dept</th>
<th>UTSA</th>
<th>5-yr Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% first-generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 – New Undergraduate Student HS Rank – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th># New Students</th>
<th>High School Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>Top 25%</td>
<td>Second 25%</td>
<td>Third 25%</td>
<td>Fourth 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Trend (% +/-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9 – Undergraduate Key Measures – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Key Measures</th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
<th>AY 2016</th>
<th>AY 2017</th>
<th>5-yr Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
<td>Dept UTSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention Rates</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>5-yr Trend (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Time to Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in Gateway Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10 – Master’s Student Enrollment and Demographics – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Student Enrollment and Student Demographics</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>5-yr Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% first-generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11 – Master’s Key Measures – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Key Measures</th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
<th>AY 2016</th>
<th>AY 2017</th>
<th>5-yr Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention Rates (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Degrees Awarded (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Time to Degree (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduated 3 Years (J)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduated 4 Years (J)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduated 5 Years (J)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Faculty Ratio (E)</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>UTSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12 - Faculty Teaching Load (D) – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Teaching Load</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student publications and awards (*list*)

Graduate placement (i.e., employment or further Education/training) (*list*)

Graduate licensure rates (if applicable) (# *D* and *list*)
NOTE: If the department has more than one doctoral degree program, fill out a separate doctoral Program Enrollment Information page for each.

Table 13 – Doctoral Student Enrollment and Demographics – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Student Enrollment and Student Demographics</th>
<th>Fall 2013 Dept</th>
<th>Fall 2013 UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2014 Dept</th>
<th>Fall 2014 UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2015 Dept</th>
<th>Fall 2015 UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2016 Dept</th>
<th>Fall 2016 UTSA</th>
<th>Fall 2017 Dept</th>
<th>Fall 2017 UTSA</th>
<th>5-yr Trend (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% first-generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 – Doctoral Key Measures – Information from OIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention Rates (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Time to Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Time to Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduated 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduated 10 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student publications and awards (list)

Graduate placement (i.e., employment or further Education/training) (list)

Graduate licensure rates (if applicable) (# and list)
Appendix A: Handbook of Operating Procedures, Chapter 2, Section 39

2.39 Academic Program Review

I. POLICY STATEMENT
The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) provides quality programs to students in each of its academic disciplines. Quality programs result from careful, collaborative self-study and reflection by the faculty in each of the disciplines and appropriate stewardship by University administrators.

II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
A. All department programs shall undergo periodic academic program review.
B. Reviews shall be conducted by a panel of external reviewers representing expertise in the academic discipline of the programs under scrutiny.
C. The frequency of program review shall not be more than ten (10) years between successive reviews.
D. Units subject to periodic specialized accreditation reviews may use those reviews to satisfy this requirement.
E. Reviews shall be based on organizational units (for example, departments) and shall integrate reviews of all degree programs offered through those units. Exceptions include:
   1. interdisciplinary programs involving multiple departments, and
   2. instances where specialized accreditation only reviews the undergraduate or graduate programs (e.g. ABET only reviews undergraduate programs). In this event, the Department or College shall separately schedule a complementary review for programs not covered by specialized accreditation.
F. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) shall maintain a general schedule of program reviews and will notify the College Dean, Department Chair and other appropriate individuals (e.g. Program Director) no less than eight (8) months in advance of an upcoming review.
G. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain a set of guidelines specifying the process by which external reviews take place. Said guidelines will be made publicly available on the Provost’s web site.

Provost Guidelines
Process for Academic Program Review

Review Process and Timeline

A Department shall be notified at least eight (8) months in advance that a program review has been scheduled. Upon notification, the program shall implement the following process.
A. The review team and its chair shall be established six (6) months in advance of the review.
B. The Office of IE shall oversee the arrangements for the review visit.
C. The Department shall assemble its self-study materials (see “Self-Study Document” below) for posting online at least one month in advance of the review team visit and shall notify the reviewers how to access the materials.
D. Review visits shall typically extend over two (2) days and include the following meetings:
   • an initial meeting of the Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules);
   • meetings with department faculty (Department Schedules);
   • meetings with undergraduate and graduate students of the department (Department Schedules);
   • a meeting with the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, College Dean and Graduate Council representatives, and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules);
   • unscheduled time for the review team to formulate initial recommendations (Department Schedules); and
   • an exit meeting with the Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost/Dean of the University College (IE Schedules).

E. The review team shall submit a written report of their review as soon as is feasible following the completion of the review visit.

Self-Study Document

Departments undergoing a program review shall prepare a set of materials to aid external reviewers in their task of reviewing the strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities of the unit.

A. The preparation of materials for a program review should be an inclusive process, involving all faculty to the extent possible.

B. The materials should include, but need not be limited to, the following:
   1. the unit's strategic plan
   2. documentation of expected learning outcomes for each of the department’s degree programs (described in the department assessment plans and course syllabi)
   3. documentation of assessment of student learning outcomes for each degree program
   4. a summary of research productivity, as compiled from FAIR
   5. curriculum vitae for all continuing faculty
   6. program enrollment information
   7. a brief summary statement (no more than ten pages)

C. Specialized accreditation processes may require other materials in addition to those listed here.

D. The Department’s self-study materials shall be posted online for the external reviewers to access at least one (1) month in advance of the reviewers’ visit. Printed copies of the strategic plan and the summary statement shall be sent to each reviewer at the time the materials are posted.

E. A hard copy of or electronic access to all of the materials shall be made available to the chair of the review team during their visit.
**External Reviewers**

The external reviewers should be senior faculty members at institutions equivalent to the university’s aspirant institutions. Whenever possible, the reviewers should be eminent scholars and academic leaders from outside the State of Texas who have achieved national prominence.

A. Choice of reviewers
   1. A Department shall propose a list of suitable reviewers to the college Dean (hereafter, the “Dean”) at least six (6) months in advance of a scheduled review.
   2. The Dean shall select a subset of no more than three (3) reviewers from the list provided by the department.
   3. The Dean may also choose to add up to two (2) members not on the department list, but the total number of reviewers should not exceed five (5).
   4. The Dean should identify alternative reviewers in the event one (1) or more of the reviewers chosen is unable to commit to the review.
   5. The Dean shall consult with the Provost and the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School before finalizing the list of reviewers and alternates.

B. Once the set of reviewers is finalized, the Dean and Department Chair shall consult to appoint a chair for the review team from among the reviewers.

**Review Response**

The report of the external reviewers, as well as the response of the department, college, Graduate School, and University will be documented in writing.

A. Following the submission of the written report, the department shall prepare a written response to the review team recommendations and submit that response to the Dean.

B. The Dean shall review the unit response and prepare a written recommendation for the Provost.

C. If the review includes graduate programs, the Graduate Council shall receive a copy of the reviewers’ report, and may prepare a response to any recommendations involving graduate studies in the unit, and submit that response to the VPGS.

D. The VPGS and Dean shall meet with the Provost to discuss the review and their respective recommendations.

E. The Provost shall meet with the Department Chair, Department’s Graduate Advisor of Record, the Undergraduate Advisor of Record (if position assigned), the College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, and Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment to discuss the outcome of the review and formulate the final response. For those reviews that discuss faculty issues, the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Support shall also participate in the discussion.

F. The Provost shall provide a written final response to the Department indicating any actions the University will take in response to the external review.

G. One year after issuing the final response, the Provost shall meet with the Department chair, Graduate Advisor of Record, Undergraduate Advisor of Record (if department assigns this role), Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, the Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment, and the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Support (as appropriate) to review progress in responding to the external review.
Rule §5.52 Review of Existing Degree Programs

(a) In accordance with the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, each public institution of higher education shall have a process to review the quality and effectiveness of existing degree programs and for continuous improvement.

(b) The Coordinating Board staff shall develop a process for conducting a periodic audit of the quality, productivity, and effectiveness of existing bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degree programs at public institutions of higher education and health-related institutions.

(c) Each public university and health-related institution shall review all doctoral programs at least once every seven years.

(1) On a schedule to be determined by the Commissioner, institutions shall submit a schedule of review for all doctoral programs to the Assistant Commissioner of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research.

(2) Institutions shall begin each review of a doctoral program with a rigorous self-study.

(3) As part of the required review process, institutions shall use at least two external reviewers with subject-matter expertise who are employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas.

(4) External reviewers must be provided with the materials and products of the self-study and must be brought to the campus for an on-site review.

(5) External reviewers must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

(6) External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

(7) Closely-related programs, defined as sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code, may be reviewed in a consolidated manner at the discretion of the institution.

(8) Institutions shall review masters and doctoral programs in the same discipline simultaneously, using the same self-study materials and reviewers. Institutions may also, at their discretion, review bachelor’s programs in the same discipline as master’s and doctoral programs simultaneously.

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

(A) The 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs;
(B) Student retention rates;

(C) Student enrollment;

(D) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);

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

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

(G) Program facilities and equipment;

(H) Program finance and resources;

(I) Program administration; and

(J) Faculty Qualifications.

(10) Institutions shall submit a report on the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewers and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.

(11) Institutions may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.

(d) Each public university and health-related institution shall review all stand-alone master's programs at least once every seven years.

(1) On a schedule to be determined by the Commissioner, institutions shall submit a schedule of review for all master's programs to the Assistant Commissioner of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research.

(2) Institutions shall begin each review of a master's program with a rigorous self-study.

(3) As part of the required review process, institutions shall use at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution of higher education outside of Texas.

(4) External reviewers shall be provided with the materials and products of the self-study. External reviewers may be brought to the campus for an on-site review or may be asked to conduct a remote desk review.

(5) External reviewers must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

(6) External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

(7) Closely-related programs, defined as sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code, may be reviewed in a consolidated manner at the discretion of the institution.

(8) Master's programs in the same 6-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code as doctoral programs shall be reviewed simultaneously with their related doctoral programs.
Criteria for the review of master’s programs must include, but are not limited to:

(A) Faculty qualifications;
(B) Faculty publications;
(C) Faculty external grants;
(D) Faculty teaching load;
(E) Faculty/student ratio;
(F) Student demographics;
(G) Student time-to-degree;
(H) Student publication and awards;
(I) Student retention rates;
(J) Student graduation rates;
(K) Student enrollment;
(L) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);
(M) Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training);
(N) Number of degrees conferred annually;
(O) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;
(P) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;
(Q) Program facilities and equipment;
(R) Program finance and resources; and
(S) Program administration.

Institutions shall submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s) and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewer(s) have submitted their findings to the institution.

Institutions may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.

The Coordinating Board shall review all reports submitted for master's and doctoral programs and shall conduct analysis as necessary to ensure high quality. Institutions may be required to take additional actions to improve their programs as a result of Coordinating Board review.
Source Note: The provisions of this §5.52 adopted to be effective August 26, 2009, 34 TexReg 5678; amended to be effective November 29, 2010, 35 TexReg 10496; amended to be effective May 24, 2011, 36 TexReg 3183; amended to be effective August 15, 2013, 38 TexReg 5063
## Appendix C: Program Review Timeline (Fall Site Visit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Due By</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Chairs are notified of review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Program Review Orientation Session and identify self-study report team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>By June</td>
<td>Attended by Chair, Dean, and any department representatives who will work on the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit forms to Dean and IE for approval: 1) Aspirant Program Selection Form. 2) External Reviewer Nomination and Selection Form, include CVs and contact information.</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize review team members. Send letters of invite to the external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule external review dates via IE serving as the liaison between the Dept., VPDGS, VPDUS and Provost.</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward preliminary review packet to Dean and IE.</td>
<td>60 days prior to visit</td>
<td>Send to Dean &amp; Vice Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute final review packet to reviewers &amp; others.</td>
<td>30 days prior to visit</td>
<td>Send to Dean, Vice Provost, Provost, Graduate Council Representative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE VISIT</strong></td>
<td>Before April 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives external review report from Vice Provost.</td>
<td>Within 30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide response to external review report.</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
<td>Send to Dean &amp; Vice Provost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend meeting to formulate final response.</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks</td>
<td>Also attended by Dean, Provost, IE, VPDGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives final response from Provost.</td>
<td>Within 90 days</td>
<td>Review packet, external reviewer report, and final response sent to THECB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend follow-up meeting.</td>
<td>One year later</td>
<td>Attended by Chair, GAR, Dean, Provost, IE &amp; VPDGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Program Review Timeline (Spring Site Visit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Due By</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Dean and Chairs are notified of review.</td>
<td>September-October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Attend Program Review Orientation Session and identify self-study report team.</td>
<td>By November</td>
<td>Attended by Chair, Dean, and any department representatives who will work on the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit forms to Dean and IE for approval:</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Aspirant Program Selection Form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) External Reviewer Nomination and Selection Form, include CVs and contact information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize review team members. Send letters of invite to the external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule external review dates via IE serving as the liaison between the Dept., VPDGS, VPDUS and Provost.</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward preliminary review packet to Dean and IE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 days prior to visit</td>
<td>Send to Dean &amp; Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute final review packet to reviewers &amp; others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 days prior to visit</td>
<td>Send to Dean, Vice Provost, Provost, Graduate Council Representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE VISIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Before April 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives external review report from Vice Provost.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 30 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide response to external review report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
<td>Send to Dean &amp; Vice Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend meeting to formulate final response.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 4 weeks</td>
<td>Also attended by Dean, Provost, IE, VPDGS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives final response from Provost.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 90 days</td>
<td>Review packet, external reviewer report, and final response sent to THECB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend follow-up meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>One year later</td>
<td>Attended by Chair, GAR, Dean, Provost, IE &amp; VPDGS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Sample On-site Review Schedule

Two-Day Site Visit

Day, Date
Arrive in San Antonio, travel to the HOTEL NAME
Program Representative will pick up External Evaluators.

Day One, Date
7:45 a.m.
Program Representative picks up external evaluators from hotel.
8:00-9:00 a.m.
Initial Meeting with Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment and Dean of the College. Light refreshments will be served. Required meeting.
9:00-9:30 a.m.
Meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School (VPDGS).
9:30-9:45 a.m.
Department will pick up reviewers in GSR 2.204 and bring them to their next meeting.
9:45-10:15 a.m.
Graduate Council Representative and Graduate Advisor of Record (if appropriate) or Department Chair.
10:15-10:45 a.m.
Meeting with College Dean.
10:45-11:15 a.m.
Meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of the University College.
11:15-12:15 p.m.
Meeting with Undergraduate students.
12:15-1:45 p.m.
Lunch (Reviewers only)*
1:45-2:45 p.m.
Meeting with Graduate students
2:45-3:45 p.m.
Department faculty
3:45-4:30 p.m.
Tour of relevant facilities
6:30 p.m.
Dinner with Department Chair and one additional faculty member

Day Two, Date
7:45 a.m.
Program Representative picks up external evaluators from hotel.
8:00-10:00 a.m.
Other meetings (as requested)
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Reviewers prepare for Exit Interview
11:00-1:00 p.m.
Lunch and Exit Meeting - Provost, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment and Dean of the College. Required meeting.
1:00 p.m.
Depart for the airport or time for review team to begin drafting report

* This lunch is intended to give the review team time to discuss plans for the remainder of the site visit and identify any additional meetings or information.
1. **Site Visit** - The department must identify two or more potential dates for the site visit working with the external reviewers and the Dean. Once identified, the dates are forwarded to Kasey Neece-Fielder (kasey.neece-fielder@utsa.edu) and Lisa Johnston (lisa.johnston@utsa.edu). Lisa Johnston will then contact all internal personnel and arrange the first, last, VP Grad, VP Undergrad, Dean meeting’s for the site visit. After the meeting dates are confirmed with the potential reviewers and the internal personnel, the departments will send to their reviewers either through email or mail, a partially filled out SA (Service Agreement) and SIF (Supplier Information Form). At least one week prior to your review, a copy of the final schedule must be emailed to Kasey Neece-Fielder and Lisa Johnston for review.

2. **Preparing for review** - To prepare for your review, the department will put all of your documentation in your UTSA Department Review Packet folders. The department will write up a narrative (template in SharePoint). Some tables will need to be processed by your department and others through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. One (1) month prior to your review, Lisa Johnston will send a link from SharePoint to your reviewers (the UTSA Department Review Packet folders only) and to the Vice Provosts and Dean in preparation for your review.

3. **Travel Arrangements**
   a. **Airfare** - When booking airline reservations, our office (IE), is requesting that you use Southwest Airlines, if possible. If there is an issue with using them, please contact Lisa Johnston immediately. The hosting department will make the airline reservations and Lisa Johnston will pay for them with her CLIBA.

   Cost - Our office will pay up to $400 for a single airfare reservation. Any amount over the $400 will be the responsibility of the hosting department.

   b. **Lodging:**

      The reviewers will reside at the Wyndham Garden Hotel San Antonio Hotel near La Cantera and Double Tree by Hilton San Antonio Downtown. Lisa Johnston will make and pay for the hotel reservations for the reviewers upon receipt of the traveler’s itinerary.

4. **Reimbursements for Reviewers and Department Chairs**

   Once the reviewers have completed the review, you must get an invoice and either scanned or original receipts to process. Please send the receipts to Lisa Johnston for further processing. Our office (IE) pays for the following for reviewers:

   a. **Honorarium**

      *Upon receipt of the deliverables,* IE will pay honorariums to all reviewers.

   b. **Mileage**

      If a reviewer drives round trip to the airport from their residence, the maximum mileage reimbursement rate per Texas Government Code Section 660.042, is posted in Section 9 of the DTS website: [http://www.utsa.edu/financialaffairs/opguidelines/0109.html#mileageRate](http://www.utsa.edu/financialaffairs/opguidelines/0109.html#mileageRate). In order to reimburse for mileage, a map quest inquiry needs to be sent to Lisa Johnston.
Appendix F: Administrative Process for Program Reviews Overview - Continued


c. **Taxi/Shuttle Service/Mass Transit**
   If a reviewer utilizes a taxi, shuttle service, etc., they are required to turn in the scanned or original receipt(s) to the department. The department will include this as part of the incidental expenses of the traveler.

d. **Parking/Tolls**
   If a reviewer incurs a parking/toll expense(s), they are required to turn in the scanned or original receipt(s) to the department.

e. **Other Incidental, e.g., luggage, etc.**
   If a reviewer incurs other incidental expenses, e.g., luggage charges, they are required to turn in the scanned or original receipt(s) to the department.

f. **Meals**
   Reviewers will be reimbursed for their meals at per diem rates; however, they are required to turn in their scanned or original itemized receipt(s) for their incidentals. An item not reimbursed on the BEF form is alcohol.

   The following breaks down the meals throughout the visit (Day One/Two/Three):

   **Day One** – Travel day for all reviewers (partial per-diem day).

   **Day Two** – First meeting day (full per-diem day).

   Breakfast is included in the hotel reservation, paid by IE.

   Light refreshments will be served at the morning meeting, paid by IE.

   Lunch is provided and paid by the reviewing department.

   Dinner is arranged and provided by the reviewing department. IE will reimburse, except for alcohol, the UTSA employee who pays for the dinner. Reimbursement for a maximum of five (5) people is allowed, which could include two UTSA personnel and up to three reviewers. To arrange for reimbursement of the UTSA employee who paid for the dinner, the department should 1) fill out a BEF and 2) send the signed BEF and original itemized receipt via campus mail to Lisa Johnston for further processing. **Per University policy, IE will only reimburse up to (including tax and gratuity) $55 per person for dinner. If the cost goes over $55 per person, there are two options: 1) the UTSA employee can cover the difference from their personal funds or 2) the department has the option of reimbursing the UTSA employee for the difference.**

   **Day Three** – Second day of meetings and travel (partial per-diem day).

   Breakfast is included in the hotel reservation, paid by IE.

   Lunch will be provided and paid by IE.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Lisa Johnston via email at lisa.johnston@utsa.edu or at extension 4965.
Contacts

Kasey Neece-Fielder
Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment
kasey.neece-fielder@utsa.edu; x4819

Lisa Johnston
Senior Administrative Associate
lisa.johnston@utsa.edu; x4965