Purpose: The purpose of periodic review of graduate programs (as defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Texas Administrative Code; Title 19; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter C; Rule 5.52) is to provide a systematic evaluation of the quality of each academic program and its effectiveness in supporting the University mission. Regular review is required to ensure the continuing appropriateness and improvement of the University’s programs and to meet requirements of external accrediting agencies including Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and THECB. Such reviews are formative in nature, include peer review, and are conducted by representatives of the academic unit, college, and/or administration. More specifically, a systematic and scheduled graduate program review:

a. provides reliable critical information for assessing areas of strengths and limitations of the program, and its contribution to the mission of the institution
b. assists in the development of strategies to continuously improve the program;
c. includes measurable criteria to assess progress toward established goals and directions for the future;
d. demonstrates meaningful comparisons with discipline-specific standards, peer institutions, and related departments within the university; and
e. supplies baseline quantitative and qualitative data for the department and University to make well-informed decisions for program success and budget considerations.

2. Process: A seven-year review cycle has been established for each academic program. However, the Provost or Vice Provost of Research and Dean of Graduate Studies may request reviews of specific programs or departments outside the seven-year cycle. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will provide data specified in the self-study review format prior to beginning the review process. The review process includes:

a) A self-study committee, appointed by the department head with input from the college dean and Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, prepares and submits a self-study report by the designated date of the academic year to the Graduate School. The report will be developed using the Graduate Program Review format.
b) With input from the department head, the Provost, and college dean, the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a review committee, which will include at least two external reviewers. The review committee will be responsible for reviewing the program and will submit a report to the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate
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Studies. This report will be made available to the department chair, college dean and Provost.

c) A meeting with the review committee, department head, college dean, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Provost will convene one week after the review to discuss the findings and recommendations of the review team.

d) Upon consultation with the college dean, the department head submits an action plan to the Provost through the college dean, and Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies.

e) Once the college dean, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, and Provost approve the action plan, it is inserted into the report. A copy is also provided to the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and distributed to the faculty.

f) One year after the review of the department, there will be a meeting with the department head, the college dean and Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, and Provost or designee to discuss the outcomes of the action plan.

3. **Responsible Persons:** Program self-evaluation is the responsibility of all faculty members with workload assignments in the academic program. In some cases, however, a self-study committee will be appointed that will have the primary responsibility for writing the self-study report.

4. **Format and Required Information:** The template for preparing the self-study will be provided to the department by the office of Institutional Effectiveness.

5. **Timeline:** The program review process is initiated at the beginning of the fall semester, the self-study is submitted by the designated date, and the report from the review committee is completed by the designated date. The action plan, which will contain specific strategies for improvement, and estimated implementation costs, is submitted, by the designated date.

6. **Coordination with Other Reviews:** When possible, to reduce redundancy, academic program reviews will be coordinated with external state reviews, accreditation self-study and visiting committee reports (i.e., AACS, CACREP, NASM, CSWE, etc.), as well as any specifically required internal reviews.