The University of Texas at San Antonio
Academic Program Review Handbook

April 2021

Table of Contents

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. 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 their self-study materials (i.e., *Internal Program Review*).

3. The external review team visits the campus 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 Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Graduate Council Representative, and Dean of the College for distribution within the college, as appropriate.

5. The Department Chair drafts a response to the External Review Report and includes an action plan using the *Institutional Response* template. The appropriate Vice Provost (Vice Provost/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 (Vice Provost/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.

7. Follow-up meetings may be held as appropriate after the review to monitor the department's progress in responding to the external review. Meetings may be initiated by the Vice Provost/Dean of the University College and/or the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School.

8. 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.

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

Internal Program Review

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

Guidelines for the Internal Program Review are located on pages 9-19 of this handbook. The department's internal review materials will be sent electronically to the external reviewers to access *at least one month* in advance of the reviewers' visit.

External Review Team

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 two reviewers.
- The reviewers should have demonstrable subject matter expertise in order to evaluate all degree programs within the department.

The Department Chair submits the External Reviewer Nomination and Selection Form, Conflict of Interest Statements, potential reviewers' curriculum vitae (CVs), and contact information for each potential reviewer to the College Dean for review. The department should request a short, professional biography from each individual ultimately selected as an external reviewer. Biographies for all reviewers should then be uploaded to the SharePoint site by the date specified on the academic program review process timeline.

The College Dean appoints the external review team in consultation with the Provost, Director of University 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). An invitation will be extended to reviewers and the Continuous Improvement and Accreditation (CIA) Office will forward information necessary to conducting the review.

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 Internal Program Review and related information with faculty, administrators, staff, students, and others related to the department. Required meetings include:

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

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 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; 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 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. Upper administration should be involved in this process.

For all programs, the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the appropriate Vice Provost (Vice Provost/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 (Vice Provost/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 (Vice Provost/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 Vice Provost/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.

Narrative Outline

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).

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

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 programs; and
- sustainability of the programs 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 programs; and
- sustainability of the programs with regard 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 Internal Program Review, 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 (Continuous Improvement and Accreditation)](#) SharePoint site, on the left-hand side of the menu, you will find links to the: Program Review Manual, Forms to be Completed and Submitted, Templates for Academic Review Process, and Templates and Forms for Administrative use.

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

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

2) **Internal Program Review folder:**
   This folder contains the External Review Report, to be completed by the External Review Team, as well as other materials that will be provided to external reviewers. Items to be uploaded here:

   <u>Assessment folder</u>

   Undergraduate TracDat reports – provided by CIA Office
   Graduate TracDat reports – provided by CIA Office

   <u>Faculty Qualifications folder</u>

   Faculty Roster (Table 2) – provided by CIA Office from Digital Measures
   Faculty Population (Table 3) – provided by IR Office
   Curriculum Vitae for all continuing faculty – *provided by department*

   <u>Program Enrollment Information folder</u>

   Undergraduate
       Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 7) – provided by IR Office
       Key Measures (Table 8) – provided by IR Office

   Masters
       Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 9) – provided by IR Office
       Key Measures (Table 10) – provided by IR Office
       Faculty Teaching Load (Table 11) – provided by IR Office
       Master's Graduate Success (i.e., publications/awards, placement, licensure rates) – *provided by department*

   Doctoral
       Student Enrollment and Student Demographics (Table 12) – provided by IR Office
       Key Measures (Table 13) – provided by IR Office
       Doctoral Graduate Success (i.e., publications/awards, placement, licensure rates) – *provided by department*

   <u>Program Syllabi folder</u>

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

SharePoint Overview - Continued

<u>Research Productivity folder</u>

Research /Creative Productivity (Table 4) – *provided by department*
Faculty Publications (Table 5) – *provided by department*
Faculty External Grants (Table 6) – *provided by department*

<u>Strategic Plan & Program Overview folder</u>

Strategic Plan – *provided by department*
Aspirant Programs (Table 1) – *provided by department*

Narrative Self-Study Report (see outline on pages 9-10) – *provided by department*

3) Prior Academic Program Review folder:
This folder contains the last completed Academic Program Review, for reference.

Aspirant Programs

Table 1 – Aspirant Programs – Information from Department

	Fall 2020					AY 2020
	Student Enrollment					
Current Peers	**List Degrees Offered**	**# of T/TT Faculty**	**# of Undergrad Students**	**# of Master's Students**	**# of Doctoral Students (C)**	**# of Degrees Awarded By Type**
UTSA Program *						
Aspirant Department 1						
Aspirant Department 2						
Aspirant Department 3						
Aspirant Department 4						
Aspirant Department 5						

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

Faculty Qualifications

Table 2 – Faculty Roster – Information provided by CIA Office from Digital Measures.

Name	Rank	Degree	Discipline Specialty

Table 3 – Faculty Population – Information provided from IR

Rank	Fall 2016 (n/%)	Fall 2017 (n/%)	Fall 2018 (n/%)	Fall 2019 (n/%)	Fall 2020 (n/%)	5 -year Trend (%)
Professor						
Associate Professor						
Assistant Professor						

Table 4 - Research /Creative Productivity Data – Information from Department. Available in Digital Measures.

Research/Creative Productivity Data						
Citation Type (e.g., Tier 1 Journal, etc.)	# AY 2016	# AY 2017	# AY 2018	# AY 2019	# AY 2020	Five Year Total

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

Faculty Publications						
Faculty Member	# AY 2016	# AY 2017	# AY 2018	# AY 2019	# AY 2020	Five Year Total

Table 6 - Faculty external grants – Information from *http://research.utsa.edu/dashboard*

Faculty External Grants						
	AY 2016	AY 2017	AY 2018	AY 2019	AY 2020	5 -year Trend (%)
Sponsored Research Total ($)						
Number of Funding Proposals Submitted						
Average Dollar Amount Requested						
Percent of Faculty Holding Grants						
Avg. Research Expenditures /Faculty ($)						
Number of New Invention Disclosures						

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 provided from IR

Undergraduate Student enrollment and Student demographics												
	Fall 2016		Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Total Enrollment												
Gender												
Female												
Male												
Race/Ethnicity												
White Non-Hispanic												
Black Non-Hispanic												
Hispanic												
Asian or Pacific Islander												
American Indian or Alaskan Native												
International												
Unknown or Not Reported												
% first-generation												
Average Age												
Median Age												

Table 8 – Undergraduate Key Measures – Information provided from IR

Undergraduate Key Measures												
	AY 2016		AY 2017		AY 2018		AY 2019		AY 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Student Retention Rates												
# of Degrees Awarded												
Avg. Time to Degree												
Success in Gateway Courses												
Undergrad Faculty Ratio	Fall 2016		Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	

NOTE: If the department has more than one Master's degree program, fill out a separate Master's Program Enrollment Information page for *each*.

Table 9 – Master's Student Enrollment and Demographics – Information provided from IR

Master's Student Enrollment and Student Demographics											
	Fall 2016		Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Total Enrollment												
Gender												
Female												
Male												
Race/Ethnicity												
White Non-Hispanic												
Black Non-Hispanic												
Hispanic												
Asian or Pacific Islander												
American Indian or Alaskan Native												
International												
Unknown or Not Reported												
% first-generation												
Average Age												
Median Age												

Table 10 – Master's Key Measures – Information provided from IR

Master's Key Measures											
	AY 2016		AY 2017		AY 2018		AY 2019		AY 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Student Retention Rates (I)												
# of Degrees Awarded (N)												
Avg. Time to Degree (G)												
% Graduated 3 Years (J)												
% Graduated 4 Years (J)												
% Graduated 5 Years (J)												
	Fall 2016		Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
Master's Faculty Ratio (E)												

Table 11 - Faculty Teaching Load – Information provided from IR

Faculty Teaching Load														
Fall 2016			Fall 2017			Fall 2018			Fall 2019			Fall 2020		
Count	Sum	Ave	Count	Sum	Ave	Count	Sum	Ave	Count	Sum	Ave	Count	Sum	Ave

Master's Graduate Success (As applicable)

Student publications and awards *(list)*

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

Graduate licensure rates *(# and list)*

Doctoral Program Enrollment Information

NOTE: If the department has more than one doctoral degree program, fill out a separate doctoral Program Enrollment Information page for *each*.

Table 12 – Doctoral Student Enrollment and Demographics – Information provided from IR

Doctoral Student Enrollment and Student Demographics												
	Fall 2016		Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Total Enrollment												
Gender												
Female												
Male												
Race/Ethnicity												
White Non-Hispanic												
Black Non-Hispanic												
Hispanic												
Asian or Pacific Islander												
American Indian or Alaskan Native												
International												
Unknown or Not Reported												
% first-generation												
Average Age												
Median Age												

Table 13 – Doctoral Key Measures – Information provided from IR

Doctoral Key Measures												
	AY 2016		AY 2017		AY 2018		AY 2019		AY 2020		5-yr Trend (%)	
	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA	Dept	UTSA
Student Retention Rates (B)												
# of Degrees Awarded												
Avg. Time to Degree												
Median Time to Degree												
% Graduated 5 Years												
% Graduated 10 Years												

Doctoral Graduate Success (As applicable)

Student publications and awards *(list)*

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

Graduate licensure rates *(# and list)*

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)

Done	Department	Due By	Notes
	Dean and Chairs are notified of review (email).	October/November	
	Overview meeting.	January/February	Attended by Chair, Dean, and any department representatives who will work on the review.
	Data Meeting with IR Personnel.	April/May	
	Administrative Training.	Mid-April	
	Identify self-study report team.	End of first week in June	
	Submit forms to Dean and CIA for approval: 1) Aspirant Program Selection Form. 2) External Reviewer Nomination and Selection Form, Conflict of Interest Statement, CVs and contact information for each potential reviewer.	June 15	
	Finalize review team members. Send letters of invite to the external reviewers.	July 5	
	Schedule external review dates via CIA serving as the liaison between the Dept., VPDGS, VPDUS and Provost. Upload external reviewer bios to SharePoint.	July 15	
	Forward Internal Program Review to Dean and CIA.	60 days prior to visit	Send to Dean, Provost, VPDUC, VPDGS, and Graduate Council Representative
	Distribute final Internal Program Review to reviewers & others.	30 days prior to visit	
	SITE VISIT	**Before November 30**	
	Receive external review report from reviewers.	Within 30 days	
	Provide response to external review report (Department Chair drafts).	Within 3 weeks	Send to Dean, VPDUC, VPDGS
	Obtain signatures on final response from College Dean, VPDUC, VPDGS, and Provost.	Within 30 days	Internal Program Review, External Review Report, and Institutional Response sent to THECB and UT System.
	Attend follow-up meetings.	As appropriate	Attended by Chair, Dean, VPDUC & VPDGS.

Appendix C: Program Review Timeline (Spring Site Visit)

Done	Department	Due By	Notes
	Dean and Chairs are notified of review (email).	March/April	
	Overview meeting.	May/June	Attended by Chair, Dean, and any department representatives who will work on the review.
	Data Meeting with IR Personnel.	September/October	
	Administrative Training.	Mid-September	
	Identify self-study report team.	End of first week in November	
	Submit forms to Dean and CIA for approval: 1) Aspirant Program Selection Form. 2) External Reviewer Nomination and Selection Form, Conflict of Interest Statement, CVs and contact information for each potential reviewer.	November 15	
	Finalize review team members. Send letters of invite to the external reviewers.	December 5	
	Schedule external review dates via CIA serving as the liaison between the Dept., VPDGS, VPDUS and Provost. Upload external reviewer bios to SharePoint.	December 15	
	Forward Internal Program Review to Dean and CIA.	60 days prior to visit	Send to Dean, Provost, VPDUC, VPDGS, and Graduate Council Representative
	Distribute final Internal Program Review to reviewers & others.	30 days prior to visit	Send to Dean, Vice Provost, VPDUC, VPDGS
	SITE VISIT	**Before April 30**	
	Receive external review report from reviewers.	Within 30 days	
	Provide response to external review report (Department Chair drafts).	Within 3 weeks	Send to Dean, VPDUC, VPDGS.
	Obtain signatures on final response from College Dean, VPDUC, VPDGS, and Provost	Within 30 days	Internal Program Review, External Review Report, and Institutional Response sent to THECB and UT System.
	Attend follow-up meetings.	As appropriate	Attended by Chair, Dean, VPDUC & VPDGS.

Appendix D: Sample On-site Review Schedule

Arrival Day
Date – (Month/Date) — Visitors to arrive in San Antonio. Program Representative (from Department) will pick up External Evaluators from airport and bring them to the hotel.

Reviewers will be staying at the DoubleTree by Hilton San Antonio Northwest, 6809 North Loop 1604 West, San Antonio, TX 78249 - (210) 690-0300 (Main Campus visit) or Double Tree by Hilton San Antonio Downtown, 502 W. Cesar E. Chavez, San Antonio, TX 78207 – (210) 224-7155 (Downtown visit).

Day One of Meetings
Date – (Month/Date)

7:45 a.m. — Program Representative picks up external evaluators from hotel and brings them to the conference room for initial meeting.

8:00-9:00a.m. — Initial Meeting with Provost, Director of University Assessment, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, 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. *Required meeting.*

9:30-9:45 a.m. — Department will pick up reviewers and bring them to their next meeting.

9:45-10:15 a.m. — Meeting with Graduate Council Representative and, if appropriate, Graduate Advisor of Record. *Required meeting.*

10:15-10:45 a.m. — Meeting with College Dean. *Required meeting.*

10:45-11:15 a.m. — Meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of the University College. *Required meeting.*

11:15-12:15 p.m. — Meeting with Undergraduate students - Department to set up.

12:15-1:45 p.m. — Lunch (Reviewers only)*

1:45-2:45 p.m. — Meeting with Graduate students - Department to set up.

2:45-3:45 p.m. — Meeting with Department faculty - Department to set up.

3:45-4:30 p.m. — Tour of relevant facilities - Department to set up.

6:30 p.m. — Dinner with Department Chair, one additional faculty member, and reviewers - Department to set up.

Appendix D: Sample On-site Review Schedule – Continued

Day Two of Meetings
Date – (Month/Date)

7:45 a.m.   Program Representative picks up external evaluators from hotel and brings them to UTSA.

8:30–9:30 a.m.   Meeting with Department Chair. ***Required meeting****.*

9:30-10:00 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 - Meeting with Provost, Director of University Assessment, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, 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.

(Department) Virtual Academic Program Review Agenda – (Dates of review)

All meetings are in Central Time Zone

Day One of Meetings - (Date)

8:00-9:00a.m.   Initial Meeting with Provost, Director of University Assessment, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment and Dean of the College. *Required meeting*.

9:00-9:30 a.m.   Meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. *Required meeting.*

9:45-10:15 a.m.   Meeting with Graduate Council Representative and Graduate Advisor of Record (if appropriate) or Department Chair. *Required meeting.*

10:15-10:45 a.m.   Meeting with College Dean. *Required meeting.*

10:45-11:15 a.m.   Meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of the University College. *Required meeting.*

11:15-12:15 p.m.   Meeting with Undergraduate students – <mark>Department to set up</mark>

1:45-2:45 p.m.   Meeting with Graduate students – <mark>Department to set up</mark>

2:45-3:45 p.m.   Meeting with Department faculty – <mark>Department to set up</mark>

Day Two of Meetings – (Date)

8:30–9:30 a.m.   Meeting with Department Chair. *Required meeting*

9:30-10:30 a.m.   Exit Meeting - Meeting with Provost, Director of University Assessment, Vice Provost/Dean of the University College, Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Planning and Assessment and Dean of the College. *Required meeting*.

Appendix F: Administrative Process for Program Reviews Overview

1. **Site Visit**

Once CIA notifies the College Dean which departments will be reviewed; the Dean will get in touch with those departments. CIA will then set up an introductory meeting with the Dean, Department Chairs and Admins from those departments. Lisa Johnston will set up an admin meeting after the introduction meeting has been held. The department(s) will then decide what external reviewers they want to use (all located out of the state of Texas), decide on two or more potential dates for the site visit while working with the external reviewers and the Dean. Once the dates are identified, the dates are forwarded to Lisa Johnston (lisa.johnston@utsa.edu) so that she can contact all internal personnel and arrange the first, last, VP Grad, VP Undergrad, GAR/UGAR, Dean, and Department Chair's meetings for the site visit according to the "Sample On-site Review Schedule" in the Handbook (Appendix D). When all dates have been confirmed, the department will send the external reviewers an invitation email. During this time, Lisa Johnston will create and send Zoom meeting emails to the UTSA personnel for each meeting time. A copy of the final schedule must be emailed to Lisa Johnston and Kathy Paradise *at least one week* before the site visit.

2. **Service Agreement (SA)**

After the reviewers have been approved, the departments will then send to their reviewers through either email or mail, a partially filled out Service Agreement (SA). Once the form comes back and all approvals have been procured, the SA's will then be sent to Lisa Johnston for further signatures and input into the Contract area of Rowdy Exchange. Once the contracts come back fully approved, Lisa Johnston will send the departments a copy of the SAs for their records and for their reviewers.

3. **PaymentWorks Vendor Onboarding Process**

While you are waiting for the final approval of the Service Agreements, the departments will send a PaymentWorks invitation to your reviewers.

PaymentWorks is UTSA's new financial software that is a platform to automate the collection of payee banking details, thus eliminating manual, paper-based processes. This software can be found in Rowdy Exchange and takes the place of a Suppliers Information Form (SIF).

4. **Preparing for review**

To prepare for your review, each department will receive a permission link to their departments SharePoint folders. All of your documents will be placed in the Internal Program Review folders, except for any Completed Forms. The department will write up a narrative (template in SharePoint) and some tables will need to be processed by your department. All other tables and files are provided by either the Office of Institutional Research or CIA. All documentation needs to be in your SharePoint folders no later than 60 days prior to your review. Sixty (60) days prior to your review, Lisa Johnston will send a SharePoint link to UTSA personnel to review your documents. Thirty (30) days prior to your review, Lisa Johnston will send a SharePoint link to your reviewers.

5. **Travel Arrangements – If Applicable**

a. **Airfare** - When booking airline reservations, our office (CIA), would appreciate if your department would 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 OneCard.

Cost - Our office is able to 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 either the Double Tree by Hilton San Antonio Northwest (Main Campus visit) or Double Tree by Hilton San Antonio Downtown (Downtown visit). Lisa Johnston will make and pay for the hotel reservations for the reviewers upon receipt of the traveler's itinerary.

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

Once the reviewers have completed the review, you must get an invoice and *original receipts* so that their travel can be processed. Please send the receipts to Lisa Johnston for further processing. Our office (CIA) pays for the following for reviewers:

a.   **Honorarium** - *Upon receipt of the deliverables*, CIA will pay honorariums to all reviewers.

b.   **Mileage** - If a reviewer drives to UTSA, 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. The department will need to compare the cost between airfare and mileage reimbursement and send the results to Lisa Johnston via email prior to making any final travel arrangements.

c.   **Taxi/Uber/Lyft/Shuttle Service/Mass Transit** - If a reviewer utilizes a taxi, Uber, shuttle service, etc., they are required to turn in the original receipt(s) to the department to be reimbursed.

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

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 original receipt(s) to the department to be reimbursed.

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

The following breaks down the meals throughout the visit:

First and second day of meetings (morning) – Breakfast is included in the hotel reservation, paid by CIA.

First day of meetings – Light refreshments will be provided to all meeting attendees, paid by CIA. Lunch will be provided by reviewing department. Dinner will be provided by reviewing department, but cost will be reimbursed to Department Chair and faculty member.

Dinner is arranged and provided by the reviewing department. CIA 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 (usually the department chair and one faculty member) and up to three reviewers. To reimbursement the UTSA employee who paid for the dinner, the department fills out a BEF (https://www.utsa.edu/financialaffairs/details.cfm?form_number=2) then send the signed BEF and original itemized receipt is sent via campus mail to Lisa Johnston for further processing. **Per University policy, CIA 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.

Second day of meetings - Lunch will be provided and paid for by CIA before the reviewers fly back to their homes.

Contacts

Kathy Paradise
Director of University Assessment
kathy.paradise@utsa.edu; x4704

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

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