

The University of Texas at San Antonio Academic Program Review Handbook



Updated Fall 2022

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Overview of the Review Process	4
Internal Program Review and Narrative Outline.....	5
Executive Summary and Dean's Self-Study Overview and Response.....	7
Review Team.....	8
Review Visit.....	9
External Review Report.....	10
Institutional Response.....	11
SharePoint Overview.....	12
Appendix A: Texas Administrative Code.....	13
Appendix B: Program Review Timeline (Fall Site Visit).....	16
Appendix C: Program Review Timeline (Spring Site Visit).....	18
Appendix D: Sample On-site Review Schedule.....	20
Appendix E: Administrative Process for Program Reviews Overview.....	22
Contacts	24

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 (THECB) (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:

- clarification of program goals, strengths, and weaknesses;
- evaluation of the quality of the unit's academic programs;
- review and possible revision of objectives for the teaching, research and service missions of the department 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.

The Academic Program Review process consists of three components: Internal Program Review, External Review Report, and Institutional Response.

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 in addition to the Associate Dean(s) and designated college level staff representatives. The program review process is comprised of the following steps:

1. External and internal ad hoc reviewers are selected, and a site visit is arranged.
2. The department prepares and obtains approval of their self-study materials (i.e., *Internal Program Review*). The Dean prepares the *Dean's Self-Study Overview and Response* to be included with the *Internal Program Review*.
3. The review team visits the campus or conducts a desk/virtual review and submits the *External Review Report* to the Director of University Assessment within 30 days after the visit.
4. The Director of University Assessment forwards the report to the Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean of the College for distribution within the college, as appropriate.
5. The Dean and Department Chair draft a response to the External Review Report that includes an action plan using the *Institutional Response* template. The appropriate Vice Provost (Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School), College Dean, and Department Chair collaborate to finalize the response and action plan.
6. The finalized *Institutional Response* is signed by the Provost, the appropriate Vice Provost (Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School), and the College Dean and submitted to the Director of University Assessment for submission to the THECB and UT System. A copy will be sent to the Graduate Council Representative.
7. Action plans developed from the academic program review process may be incorporated into the Dean's Annual Review process for updates to be given and feedback to be provided. In addition, departments are encouraged to incorporate action items into their annual assessment plans, as appropriate.
8. Follow-up meetings may be held as appropriate after the review to monitor the department's progress. Meetings may be initiated by the Provost, Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School.

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

Internal Program Review and Narrative Outline

The centerpiece of the review process is the Internal Program Review, or self-study. This step provides an opportunity for reflection and assessment of the department's future directions in support of the University's continued goal to reach Tier One status.

The Internal Program Review materials include items such as curriculum vitae, syllabi, strategic planning documents, and a narrative describing various aspects of the department and its academic programs.

The department's internal review materials will be sent electronically to the review team *at least* two weeks in advance of the reviewers' visit.

The narrative within the Internal Program Review or self-study should provide enough information for external reviewers to thoroughly complete the External Review Report provided by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

Data received from Institutional Research should be included in the narrative either in the body or as an appendix and then discussed in the narrative. Departments will need to provide additional data for the narrative. The narrative should follow the outline below.

Table of Contents

List Participants and Authors

- I. **Program Description** – *This section provides an overview of the program's mission and contribution to the University's strategic plan. Refer to the department's strategic plan and degrees, majors, minors, and certificates. While leadership recognizes the ongoing need for additional faculty and space across programs, the scope of this review should focus on the following sections:*

Mission and Vision Statement - *Extract statements from the department strategic plan.*

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 program contributes to the mission of the college and the University.*

Undergraduate Program (*include the link to the standard curriculum and sequence of courses from the University catalog*)

Graduate Program (*include the link to the standard curriculum and sequence of courses from the University catalog*)

- II. **Student Support**

Number and percent of current full-time and part-time students financially supported (research assistantship, teaching assistantship, scholarship)

Average number of years of financial support provided to full-time and part-time students

Average amount of financial support for full-time and part-time students by source (institution, research grant, etc.)

- III. Student Research/Training and Publication Opportunities**
Describe support for student research and teaching opportunities and student publications and conference participation
- IV. Annual Review of Progress and Preparation for Multiple Careers**
Describe annual review of progress of graduate students or IDP and how graduate students develop transferrable skills and prepare for multiple careers (refer to the graduate school website and include the link: <https://graduateschool.utsa.edu/current-students/>)
- V. Department Facilities and Support Resources** – *Describe the facilities and support resources utilized within your department.*
- VI. Organization and Administration** – *Describe your department bylaws, committee structure and administration.*
- VII. Strengths** – *Summarize the department’s assessment of the strengths of the program reviewed; focus on those things the department does particularly well.*
- VIII. Opportunities for Growth** – *Describe internal and/or external opportunities available to the program and how these opportunities can develop the program in the future.*
- IX. External Challenges** – *Summarize the department’s assessment of the external challenges facing the program.*
- X. Aspirant Departments** – *Use information provided about programs at other institutions as context for comparison.*
- XI. Future Plans** – *Briefly describe the department’s plans for the next five years. Cite the program's strategic plan.*

Note: All data outlined on the Summary of Data for APR spreadsheet in SharePoint must be included within the Narrative Self-Study Report either within the body or as an appendix. Then, the data should also be discussed within the Narrative Self-Study Report.

Executive Summary and Dean's Self-Study Overview and Response

Executive Summary

An executive summary written by the Department Chair should be included as an introduction to the self-study document. Using data provided, address the following points in the executive summary:

- program ranking
- faculty excellence (e.g., awards received)
- research excellence
- student support
- student placement
- potential for growth as a Hispanic serving institution

Dean's Self-Study Overview and Response

Completed by the Dean of the college, the Dean's Self-Study Overview and Response is not considered part of the self-study but should accompany it, as a separate document that should not exceed 5 pages in length. While leadership recognizes the continuous need for additional faculty and space across programs, the scope of this review should focus on the following:

- a succinct statement of your vision for the college and how the department being reviewed fits within the college vision and the goals you have for the department,
- your response to the department's self-study,
- up to three overarching questions to be addressed by reviewers,
- an overview of the department's finances and resources, and
- any other information or context not included in the self-study that would be helpful to reviewers ahead of the scheduled program review visit.

Review Team

Each review team should include a mix of both external and internal ad hoc reviewers.

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.
- Academic Program Reviews for each department must have at least three reviewers.
- The reviewers should have demonstrable subject matter expertise in order to evaluate all degree programs within the department.

Each review team must also include at least two internal ad hoc reviewers from a list of approved individuals. One internal ad hoc reviewer should be from inside the college but not from the department being reviewed. The other should be from outside of the college.

Together the external and internal ad hoc reviewers will make up the review team of the department being reviewed. Internal ad hoc reviewers should be able to assist and/or provide additional perspectives, but ultimately it is the external reviewers who provide leadership for the academic program review. Only external reviewers draft the report and are included as the authors. The internal reviewers can provide comments for the external reviewers to consider in the report.

The Department Chair submits the Reviewer Nomination and Selection Recommendation Form to the College Dean who then recommends the members of the review team and one external nomination to serve as the Review Team Chair (i.e., leads the review process and prepares the post-visit final report). This completed and signed form should be submitted to Continuous Improvement and Accreditation. The final decision regarding the members of the review team (external, chair, and internal ad hoc) will be made by the Provost, the Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College (if the department has undergraduate programs) and/or Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the Graduate School (if the department has graduate programs). The department will provide the contact information for each potential reviewer to Continuous Improvement and Accreditation (CI&A) and CI&A will extend an invitation to reviewers, along with information necessary to conducting the review.

Deans and Associate Deans should carefully review all recommended reviewers, utilizing their professional connections, to ensure there are no conflict of interests with any reviewer nominations.

Once reviewers have agreed to serve as part of the review team, all communication regarding the academic review process should go through Continuous Improvement and Accreditation. Continuous Improvement and Accreditation will obtain the Conflict of Interest Statements and potential reviewers' curriculum vitae (CVs). CVs are not needed for potential internal ad hoc reviewers. Reviewers should be referred to Continuous Improvement and Accreditation if they have any questions or need additional information.

Review Visit

The review team spends up to two days discussing the Internal Program Review and information related to the department. The department will provide names to CI&A of all faculty, staff, and students who will attend various meetings. All required meetings which will be scheduled by CI&A include:

- an initial meeting with the Provost, Director of University Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College;
- meetings with department faculty;
- meetings with undergraduate and graduate students of the department;
- individual meetings with the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, College Dean, Graduate Council representatives, and Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College;
- time for the review team to formulate initial recommendations; and
- an exit meeting with the Provost, Director of University Assessment, College Dean, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College.

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

External Review Report

The 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; 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 for the succeeding steps of the review process.

A template is provided and must be used for the External Review Report.

Institutional Response

After the External Review Report is received, the department shall draft an Institutional Response (using a provided template) to the review. Per THECB guidance, this includes an evaluation of the main findings of the review, a response to each of the reviewers' recommendations, and an indication as to whether or not the institution will accept and act upon each recommendation. An action plan detailing the department's proposed strategies, a timeline to address the reviewers' recommendations, and the name of the person responsible for each action must also be included. For any recommendations that are not accepted or acted upon, a rationale must be provided. The Institutional Response must also indicate who provided input for and who reviewed the response.

For all programs, the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the appropriate Vice Provost (Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School or their representatives) will finalize the response and action plan. The final response and action plan will be signed by the College Dean, the appropriate Vice Provost (Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School), and the Provost, and will be forwarded to the THECB and UT System to meet their corresponding requirements.

The Department Chair, College Dean, and appropriate Vice Provost (Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School) may plan additional meetings as appropriate to review progress in responding to the external review. The Provost, Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College and/or Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School may initiate these meetings.

Action plans developed from the academic program review process may also be incorporated into the Dean's Annual Review process for updates to be given and feedback to be provided. In addition, departments are encouraged to incorporate action items into their annual assessment plans, as appropriate.

SharePoint Overview

From the Academic Program Review (Continuous Improvement and Accreditation SharePoint site, on the left-hand menu, you will find links to the: Program Review Manual, Forms to be Completed and Submitted, and Templates and Forms for Administrative use. You will also find the Summary of Data for APR spreadsheet which summarizes all the data that must be included and explained in the self-study.

Click on the button for the applicable department. You will see three folders:

1) Prior Academic Program Review folder:

This folder contains the last completed Academic Program Review, for reference.

2) Completed Forms folder:

Upload completed forms related to the visit here.

3) Internal Program Review folder:

This folder contains the External Review Report, to be completed by the external reviewers on the review team, as well as other materials that will be provided to the review team. Items to be uploaded here:

Assessment and Strategic Plan folder

Undergraduate Nuventive assessment reports – provided by CI&A Office

Graduate Nuventive assessment reports – provided by CI&A Office

Strategic Plan – *provided by department*

Curriculum Vitae folder

Curriculum Vitae for all department faculty – *provided by department. Can be produced from Digital Measures (please work with CI&A on this piece).*

Program Syllabi folder

Course Syllabi – one example per course – *provided by department*

Data folder

Data in folder - *provided by Institutional Research*

Appendix A: Texas Administrative Code

TITLE 19	EDUCATION
PART 1	TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
CHAPTER 5	RULES APPLYING TO PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND/OR SELECTED PUBLIC COLLEGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS
SUBCHAPTER C	APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND REVIEW OF EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS
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 ten 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 Academic Quality and Workforce.
 - (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 master's 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 Characteristics of Texas Public 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 Academic Quality and Workforce Division no later than 180 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.
- (11) Institutions may submit reviews of graduate programs 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 ten 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 Academic Quality and Workforce.
 - (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.
 - (9) 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.
- (10) 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 Academic Quality and Workforce Division no later than 180 days after the reviewer(s) have submitted their findings to the institution.
- (11) Institutions may submit reviews of graduate programs performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.
- (e) 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.

Appendix B: Program Review Timeline (Fall Site Visit)

Department	Due By	Notes
Dean, Chair, Associate Dean(s) and designated college staff representatives are notified of review (email).	October/November	
Overview meeting.	January	Attended by Chair, Dean, Associate Dean(s) and designated college staff representatives and any department representatives who will work on the review.
Administrative Training.	January (after Overview meeting)	
Submit Aspirant Program Selection Form and Graduate Faculty Tables to CI&A.	March	
Data Meeting with IR Personnel if needed.	May	
Identify self-study report team.	End of last week in April	
Submit Reviewer Nomination and Recommendation Form, Conflict of Interest Statement, CVs and contact information for each potential reviewer to CI&A.	April	
Finalize review team members. CI&A send letters of invite to the external reviewers.	May	
Schedule external review dates via CI&A serving as the liaison between the Dept., Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost.	May	
Forward Internal Program Review to College Dean for review.	60 days prior to Internal Program Review being forwarded to Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost	Dept sends to Dean, after review Dean forwards to CI&A
Forward Internal Program Review.	45 days prior to visit	Send to Dean, Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost
Distribute final Internal Program Review to reviewers.	15 days prior to visit	
SITE VISIT	Before November 30	
Receive external review report from reviewers.	Within 30 days	Send to Dean
Provide response to external review report (Department Chair and Dean draft).	Within 3 weeks	Send to Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US
Obtain signatures on final response from Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost	Within 30 days	Internal Program Review, External Review Report, and Institutional Response sent to Graduate Council Representative, and THECB and UT System.

Attend follow-up meetings.	As appropriate	Attended by Chair, Dean, Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC and VP/Dean of US.
----------------------------	----------------	---

Appendix C: Program Review Timeline (Spring Site Visit)

Department	Due By	Notes
Dean, Chair, Associate Dean(s) and designated college staff representatives are notified of review (email).	March/April	
Overview meeting.	May	Attended by Chair, Dean, Associate Dean(s) and designated college staff representatives and any department representatives who will work on the review.
Administrative Training.	May (after Overview meeting)	
Submit Aspirant Program Selection Form and Graduate Faculty Tables to CI&A.	July	
Data Meeting with IR Personnel if needed.	October	
Identify self-study report team.	End of last week in September	
Submit Reviewer Nomination and Recommendation Form, Conflict of Interest Statement, CVs and contact information for each potential reviewer to CI&A.	September	
Finalize review team members. CI&A send letters of invite to the external reviewers.	October	
Schedule external review dates via CI&A serving as the liaison between the Dept., Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost	October	
Forward Internal Program Review to College Dean for review.	60 days prior to Internal Program Review being forwarded to Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost	Dept sends to Dean, after review Dean forwards to CI&A
Forward Internal Program Review.	45 days prior to visit	Send to Dean, Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost
Distribute final Internal Program Review to reviewers.	15 days prior to visit	
SITE VISIT	Before April 30	
Receive external review report from reviewers.	Within 30 days	Send to Dean
Provide response to external review report (Department Chair and Dean draft).	Within 3 weeks	Send to Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US
Obtain signatures on final response from Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC, VP/Dean of US, and Provost	Within 30 days	Internal Program Review, External Review Report, and Institutional Response sent to Graduate Council Representative, and THECB and UT System.

Attend follow-up meetings.	As appropriate	Attended by Chair, Dean, Snr VP of AA/Dean of UC and VP/Dean of US
----------------------------	----------------	--

- 1:15-2:00p.m.** Meeting with Undergraduate students - (Location TBD).
- 2:00-2:45p.m.** Meeting with Graduate students - (Location TBD).
- 2:45-3:00p.m.** Break
- 3:00-3:45p.m.** Meeting with Department (tenure-track faculty) – (Location TBD).
- 3:45-4:30p.m.** Meeting with Department (fixed-term track faculty) - (Location TBD).
- 4:30-5:00p.m.** Tour of relevant facilities - (Location TBD).
- 6:30p.m.** Dinner with Department Chair, two additional faculty members (one tenured and one tenure-track), and review team (all 5 members).

Day Two of Meetings – (Month/Date)

- 8:00a.m.** Program representative picks up external review team members from hotel and brings them to conference room for day two meetings - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 8:30-9:00a.m.** Meeting with Graduate Council Representative and, if appropriate, Graduate Advisor of Record - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 9:00-9:15a.m.** Break
- 9:15–10:00a.m.** Meeting with Department Chair - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 10:00-10:45a.m.** Follow-up meetings, as requested by reviewers - (Location TBD).
- 10:45a.m.-12:00p.m.** Review Team - prepare for Exit Meeting - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 12:00-12:30p.m.** Lunch (Review Team only – all 5 members) - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 12:30-1:00p.m.** Exit Meeting - Meeting with Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Director of University Assessment, Senior Vice Provost Academic Affairs/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost of Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the College - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 1:00-1:15p.m.** Wrap-up Meeting – Director of University Assessment - (Provost’s Conference Room, Main Building, 4.120F).
- 1:15p.m.** Depart for the airport or time for review team to begin drafting report.

Appendix E: Administrative Process for Program Reviews Overview

1. **Site Visit** - The Continuous Improvement and Accreditation (CI&A) department will be working with your chosen reviewers and internal UTSA personnel, to include the College Dean, for potential dates for your site visit. Lisa Johnston will schedule all site visit meetings and send your external reviewers a Service Agreement (SA) and a PaymentWorks Invitation.

The agenda for the site visit will be emailed to the review team and department prior to the visit.

2. **Travel Arrangements**

- a. **Airfare**

Lisa Johnston will be booking and paying for your external reviewers' airline reservations. Once the arrangements are complete, she will send a copy of the arrangements to the department admin for their information.

- b. **Lodging**

The external reviewers will stay at the DoubleTree by Hilton San Antonio Northwest or DoubleTree by Hilton San Antonio Downtown depending on the location of the site visit. Lisa Johnston will make and pay for the hotel reservations for the reviewers.

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

Once the external reviewers have completed the review, they will send (either through email or USPS mail) all receipts to Lisa Johnston for their visit. Our office (CI&A) pays for the following for external reviewers:

- a. **Honorarium**

Upon receipt of the deliverables, CI&A will pay honorariums to all external reviewers.

- b. **Mileage**

If a reviewer drives round trip to the airport from their residence, the maximum mileage reimbursement rate per Texas Govt. Code Section 660.042, is posted in Section 9 of the [DTS website](#).

- c. **UBER/Lyft/Taxi/Shuttle Service/Mass Transit**

If a reviewer utilizes UBER/Lyft/Taxi, shuttle service, etc., they are required to turn in the scanned or original receipt(s) to Lisa Johnston. Lisa will include this as part of the incidental expenses of the traveler.

- d. **Parking/Tolls**

If an external reviewer incurs a parking/toll expense(s), they are required to turn in the scanned or original receipt(s) to Lisa Johnston.

- e. **Other Incidentals, 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 Lisa Johnston.

Appendix E: Administrative Process for Program Reviews Overview (Continued)

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 any additional incidentals they have incurred. An item not reimbursed on the BEF form is alcohol.

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

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

Breakfast is included in the hotel reservation (All three days), paid by CI&A.

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

Lunch is provided to the reviewers and paid by the CI&A.

Dinner is arranged and provided by the reviewing department. CI&A will reimburse, except for alcohol, the UTSA employee who pays for the dinner. Reimbursement for a maximum of eight (8) people is allowed, which could include two UTSA personnel (usually the Department Chair and two faculty members) and up to five reviewers. To arrange for reimbursement of the UTSA employee who paid for the dinner, the department will 1) fill out a BEF and 2) send the signed BEF and original itemized receipt via either campus mail or email to Lisa Johnston for further processing.

**Per University policy, CI&A will only reimburse up to (including tax and gratuity) \$70 per person for dinner. If the cost goes over \$70 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).

Lunch will be provided to all meeting participants and paid by CI&A.

Contacts

Kathy Paradise
Director of University Assessment
kathy.paradise@utsa.edu

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

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