

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>The University of North Texas at Dallas Policy Manual</b> | Chapter 6.000          |
| <b>6.020 Academic Program Review</b>                         | <b>Faculty Affairs</b> |

**Policy Statement.** The University of North Texas at Dallas (UNT) offers high-quality academic programs that are achieved through collaborative self-study and reflection by the faculty in each of the disciplines and appropriate stewardship by university administrators. To maintain the quality of these programs, the University requires, in compliance with THECB and 19 Texas Administrative Code §5.52, periodic review of its curriculum, operations, and resources.

**Application of Policy.** This policy applies university-wide to all undergraduate and graduate-level academic programs.

**Procedures and Responsibilities.**

**Governing Principles.**

1. All undergraduate and graduate programs shall undergo a periodic academic program review. THECB refers to the academic program review for graduate programs as a Graduate Program Review (GPR) in its terminology.
2. Reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the guidelines set out in 19 TAC §5.52 and as promulgated by the THECB.
3. Each graduate program shall normally be reviewed at least once every ten (10) years. The first review of graduate programs must take place no later than after the seventh year of the start of the program. Any program may be subject to a more frequent review as determined by the Provost. If a department or program has a specialized/programmatic accreditation process that requires a review less often than every ten years, an additional review is not required under this policy and/or THECB so long as the process includes the review and reporting requirements as listed in 19 TAC §5.52. The Director of University Accreditation and Policy maintains the GPR calendar review cycle and, to the most achievable extent possible, the GPR and specialized/programmatic accreditation schedule aligns. No more than 20% of UNTD graduate level programs may be scheduled during the same year. The Director of University Accreditation and Policy is responsible for

submitting the GPR schedule to THECB.

4. The Director of University Accreditation and Policy shall maintain a general schedule of graduate program reviews and will notify the Graduate Dean, School Dean, Program Coordinator/Chair, and other appropriate individuals no less than eleven (11) to fifteen (15) months in advance of an upcoming review.
5. The Director of University Accreditation and Policy shall maintain a set of guidelines and templates specifying the process by which external reviews take place.

### **Guidelines.**

#### **I. Graduate Program Review Process and Timeline.**

1. The Graduate Program Review process is three steps and requires three documents to be submitted to THECB. The applicable program shall (1) assemble its self-study materials (see “Self-Study Template” below) and submit it to the external reviewer, (2) get a written response back from the reviewer, and then (3) submit a letter back to the reviewer indicating how the program intends to use the review to continuously improve. These three documents will be due to the Director of University Accreditation and Policy so they may be submitted to THECB usually in August but no later than 180 days after the review and findings.
2. Per 19 TAC §5.52, Masters Programs (that are not in the same discipline as a doctoral program) may opt to utilize an electronic external review, instead of the external reviewer coming to campus. In the case of a Masters level program being in the same discipline as a doctoral program, an on-campus review is mandatory and the Program Coordinator/Chair shall oversee the arrangements for the review visit. If a Doctoral-level program is to be reviewed, the external review must take place on campus as well. The below serves as guidelines for on-site external review visits.
3. On-Site External Review: Review visits shall typically extend over two days and include the following meetings:
  - i. an initial meeting on the first day attended by the Provost, Graduate School Dean, Dean of the School, and Program

Coordinator/Chair with the reviewer/review team (doctoral programs must have at least two (2) reviewers;

- ii. meetings with departmental faculty;
- iii. meetings with students of the Department;
- iv. a meeting with a graduate faculty member, when appropriate;
- v. other meetings as requested by the review team;
- vi. unscheduled time for the review team to formulate initial recommendations; and
- vii. an exit interview with the Provost, Graduate School Dean, School Dean, and Program Coordinator/Chair

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

4. The applicable Department or Division will draft a response to the reviewers' report (see "Reviewers' Report and Responses" below).

## II. Self-Study Document (Step 1).

A program undergoing a graduate program review shall prepare a set of materials to aid the external reviewer(s) in their task of reviewing the strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities of the program.

1. The preparation of materials for a program review should be an inclusive process, involving all continuing faculty members to the extent possible.
2. The materials should include, but need not be limited to, the following:
  - i. the program's webpage
  - ii. the unit's strategic plan;
  - iii. documentation of expected program and student course learning outcomes described in the assessment plans and course syllabi;
  - iv. documentation of assessment of student learning outcomes for each program and how these results have been used to improve

the quality of the academic program;

- v. a summary of research productivity;
- vi. faculty qualifications including curriculum vitae for all continuing faculty detailing publications and grants;
- vii. program enrollment information and other metrics including but not limited to graduation rates, number of degrees conferred annually, graduate employment/licensure rates, graduate placement, retention rates, and time to degree compared to peers over the review period, student/faculty ratio, faculty teaching loads; student demographics; student publications and awards, and
- viii. a brief summary statement of the perceived strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities of the unit. Narrative should also include alignment with program and institutional goals and purposes, list of peer programs, program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs, program facilities/equipment, finances and resources, and program administration.

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

### III. Selection of Reviewers.

- i. The program coordinator/chair shall propose a list of several potential external reviewers to the School Dean and THE Director of University Accreditation and Policy at least six months in advance of a scheduled review. The external reviewer(s) must be subject matter experts employed by an institution of higher education outside the state of Texas, must be from a nationally recognized discipline, must not have any conflicts of interest with UNTD, and must be employed in a closely- related program sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code.
- ii. The School Dean shall select one (or two in the case of doctoral programs) of the individuals from the list of potential external reviewers provided by the department to serve as the reviewer.

- iii. The School Dean will cover the honorarium and costs associated with the external reviewer.

#### IV. Reviewer Report (Step 2) and Response (Step 3).

1. The reviewers' report, as well as the response of the program will be documented in writing.
  
2. Following the submission of the written report, the program shall prepare a written response to the reviewers' recommendations and submit that response to the reviewer.
  
3. The Provost shall meet with the Program Coordinator/Chair, School Dean, and Dean of the Graduate School to discuss the outcome of the review.
  
4. The Provost shall provide a written final response to the department or division indicating any actions the university will take in response to the program review.

#### V. Undergraduate Program Review

At this time, institutions are not required to submit program reviews for undergraduate programs to THECB. However, in alignment with 19 TAC §5.52, institutions are required to have an internal program review process for undergraduate programs. It is the policy of UNT Dallas to follow the same process for undergraduate programs as indicated above for graduate programs, but without submitting the materials to THECB (unless requested). THECB further recommends that institutions utilize the Existing Program Performance Review (EPPR) system. The EPPR aligns with the THECB's task of outcome-based assessment and provides institutions with information to assist in program improvement. The information is made available to provide institutions with consistent and comparable programmatic-level data to assist with strategic planning, internal programmatic review, and program development.

#### References and Cross-references.

- THECB Graduate Program Review Webpage:  
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=14E25370-182A-11E8-A6640050560100A9>
- THECB Undergraduate Program Review Webpage:  
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/institutional-resources-programs/public-universities-health->

- [related-institutions/academic-program-reviews/undergraduate-program-reviews/  
Texas Administrative Code 5.52:  
https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p\\_dir=&p\\_rloc=&p\\_tloc=&p\\_ploc=&pg=1&p\\_tac=&ti=19&pt=1&ch=5&rl=52](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=1&ch=5&rl=52)

**Tools.**

- Self-Study Template

Approved: 11/15/2010

Effective: 11/15/2010

Revised:

3/7/2013; 1/6/2020