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Introduction

The external review of UT Tyler graduate programs is an essential function of the institution’s quality review process and provides perspectives not available on campus. The results of the external program reviews are included with other assessment and evaluation information in determining the quality of instruction, program efficiency and program impact. Additionally, the self-assessment and periodic program review data contribute to a body of evidence to ensure institutional effectiveness.

Careful collection and analysis of data is essential to the review process. Both qualitative and quantitative criteria are included in the review and the various criteria may be weighted differently for each graduate program. Flexibility in the application of the review criteria is appropriate to accommodate the specialized missions of the individual programs.

The following factors serve as guidelines in the preparation of the external review reports.

Guiding Principles

- UT Tyler is committed to self-assessment and to external reviews as an integral part of strategic planning, institutional effectiveness and to ensure continuing quality enhancement toward fulfillment of the UT Tyler mission;
- All graduate programs should fulfill their respective mission and purpose within the context of the UT Tyler mission;
- The graduate program should benchmark its practice against standards in aspirational programs;
- The external review is considered to be an appropriate assessment effort in the systematic evaluation of program performance and accountability;
- Participation in the review process emphasizes self-assessment and demonstrates a concern about quality, an ability to be self-critical and a willingness to act upon identified weaknesses; and
- Relevant groups within the University are included in the review process, especially when recommendations may refer to or affect particular groups.

Scope of Graduate Program Reviews

All external reviews are conducted by a minimum of one external reviewer from outside the state of Texas. The reviewer(s) visit the campus and meet with staff, faculty, students and administrators and view program facilities and resources. It is expected that the role of students in the review process will be significant. Reviewers should be selected with particular reference to their records of experience and thoughts relative to broad issues of education within their respective disciplines. Reviewers should evaluate the congruency between the Self-Study Report and their assessment of the program. They should address how well the report has captured the quality of the program and its faculty and students, how accurately it has identified the primary issues of concern and priorities for development, and how effectively the program's proposed plans will prepare it for the future. The reviewer should assess available faculty expertise, facilities, staff support, and the program structure and content in relationship to accepted norms.
The External Peer Review Process

Responsibilities of the Program

Program Step-by-Step Guide

- Review the *Guidelines and Procedures Handbook for Graduate Program External Reviews*.

- Schedule meetings with the academic dean and the Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness Office to discuss the review process, expectations and timeline.

- Department Chair provides the names of at least two potential external reviewers to the college dean. The recommendations should include a statement of the nominee credentials and documentation that clarifies the nature of any prior contact the department chair has had with each suggested reviewer.

- The college dean provides the names of at least two additional qualified reviewers with a statement of their credentials and documentation that clarifies the nature of any prior contact with each suggested reviewer. The college dean submits both lists of prospective reviewers to the Dean of the Graduate School who will determine the final selection in order of preference for participating in the external review.

- The AIE AVP contacts the prospective external reviewers in order of Graduate School Dean ranking and provides preliminary information about the scope and responsibilities of the external program review, fee-for-service, and related travel expenses reimbursement.

- The AIE AVP assists the department chair in collect MOA signatures from the Provost/VP of Academic Affairs, the VP for Business Affairs and Chief Business Officer, and the external reviewer. The department chair sends copies of the signed MOA and Supplier Information form to the AIE Office.

- Complete the Self-Study Report that includes all required components (*Appendix A – Graduate Program Self-Study Guidelines*).

- Coordinate all logistics and preparatory planning for the campus site visit.

- Provide the Self-Study Report to the reviewer(s) at least 30 days in advance of the site visit.

- Distribute the draft site visit agenda to the external reviewer, the Graduate School, and to other appropriate offices to confirm availability of attendance for key participants and determine if the reviewer has additional requests.

- Provide access to faculty roster, course outlines and syllabi, master’s theses and/or research projects, and other assessment data with sampled student artifacts prior to and during the campus site visit.

- Provide a private office with technology support for use in the site visit.
Provide opportunities to meet with students, faculty and staff, college dean, Assistant Dean for Graduate School and/or the Vice Provost & Dean of the Graduate School, the Provost, and with others administrators or offices as determined by the program and/or reviewer.

Provide an opportunity to meet with Information Technology staff and/or CIO and VP IT if the program is online only.

Provide time to work alone at the beginning and at the end of the visit.

Prepare the Program’s Written Response to the External Summary Report.

Present and discuss the Self-Study, External Summary Report and the Department Response to the Provost and Associate Provost/Dean of the Graduate School to discuss use of results and planning for ongoing improvement.

Collaborates with the AVP AIE to integrate the Self-Study, the External Summary Report and the Program’s Written Response in the annual assessment plan.

Document planned implementation of prioritized recommendations in the assessment plan for ongoing quality assurance.

Document how the improvement strategies were implemented at the end of the next assessment cycle to “close the loop.”

Program Response – Sharing Results and Tracking Improvement

**Analysis and Use of Results**

The department chair/program coordinator and faculty determine appropriate plans for improvement based on an analysis of the findings and recommendations identified in the External Summary Report. Selected highlight information from the Self-Study, External Summary Report and the program’s Written Response are included in the annual program assessment plan and copies of each document are uploaded into the Documents Repository and related as support evidence.

In most instances, the plan for ongoing improvement (Action Plan) is implemented during the subsequent semester or academic year. Typically, the plan details a projected timeline and new or reallocated resources required for implementation along with an expected impact on improved student success.

**Implementation Feedback (Follow-up)**

The department chair and faculty provide implementation feedback in the annual assessment report at the conclusion of the subsequent assessment cycle to document how/if the proposed changes for improvement were modified when implemented and the subsequent impact on program quality (“Closing the Loop”).

**Responsibilities of the External Program Reviewer(s)**

**Pre-Visit and Self-Study Review**
External program reviewers sign and return the UT Tyler Contractual Agreement through the Office of Business Affairs (see Appendix D) and The University of Texas System Supplier Information form available on the UT Tyler Financial Services website.

Review the program Self-Study and all supporting print or electronic information relevant to the review.

**Campus Visit and Post-Visit Summary Report**
- The reviewer visits the UT Tyler campus to meet with the administrators, professional staff and students directly involved with the program as well as professionals from offices that collaborate with the program under review.
- Visits may include the UT Tyler Longview University Center, the UT Tyler Palestine Campus and/or the UT Tyler Houston Engineering Center. Electronic meetings may be facilitated with instructional off-site faculty and staff as needed.
- When the graduate program provides online services/programs, time is provided for a review with the appropriate department leadership who develop, maintain and provide online programming and support services.

**External Summary Report**
The External Summary Report includes findings based on a review of the program Self-Study Report and support documentation; the campus visit; and interviews with faculty, students, administrators, staff, and community stakeholders as appropriate.

The typical External Summary Report includes the following information:
- A general description of the academic program(s) and appropriateness to the UT Tyler mission.
- A brief statement on the general process of the review, including a list of those who participated in the review. (Roster to be provided by the program)
- Overall program strengths including quantitative and qualitative data.
- Overall program challenges and opportunities including quantitative and qualitative data.
- Overall evidence that the program has used past student performance data as a basis for sound decision-making for improvement.
- Document the degree to which the program meets each of the required Master’s Program Self-Study Components as listed in the Texas Administrative Code Rule §5.52 Review of Existing Degree Programs (Appendix E).
- External reviewers may find the rubric below to be a helpful guide to measure attainment level on each component. If used, reviewer comments are requested to provide specific examples supporting the identified level of attainment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partly Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Recommendations for ongoing improvement *emphasizing improved student success and academic achievement*.
- Other information relevant to support continuing improvement.
The External Summary Report should be provided to the department chair/program coordinator, to the college dean and to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Graduate School no later than 30 days following the campus site visit. Reimbursement and fee for services are processed upon completion of the External Summary Report.

If there is more than one reviewer, a single report signed by all participants should be submitted. Dissenting opinions should be included where consensus is lacking.

**Fees for Service and Payment of Expenses**

Travel and accommodation expenses incurred by each external peer reviewer are reimbursed up to $1,500.00 and a $1,000.00 service fee for each reviewer is funded through the Office of the College Dean. Exceptions may be made on service fees and/or travel and accommodation reimbursements on a case by case basis. Pre-approval from the dean and the Provost is required for exceptions.

**Responsibilities of the Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness**

The Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness Office facilitates external reviews and serves as a resource for the programs as well as the external reviewers. The AIE Office provides the following assistance:

- Collaborates with the department chair, program coordinator, faculty and dean in the selection of external peer reviewers.
- Assists with the coordination of transportation and accommodation arrangements for external peer reviewers.
- Provides a copy of *The University of Texas at Tyler Contractual Agreement with Scope of Services* and The University of Texas System Supplier Information form to the department chair and external peer reviewer.
- Provides a copy of The University of Texas at Tyler Guidelines and Procedures Handbook for Graduate Program External Reviews and communicates Self-Study and External Summary Report expectations with the department chair, program coordinator and academic dean.
- Assists with the fee-for-services arrangements for the external reviewers with the department chair and the appropriate academic dean.
- Assists with data collection for the Self-Study and Written Response.
- Participates in the exit interview held during the campus visit as needed.
- Collaborates with the department chair, program coordinator, faculty and dean to report findings and planning in the program annual assessment plan.
- Assesses the external review process to improve the communication process, including the written guideline documents, and the overall external review process.

**Evaluation and Assessment of the External Review Process**

The external review process is assessed for ongoing improvement by the AIE Office. The means of assessment may include satisfaction surveys administered electronically to the external reviewers and to the department chair and faculty leadership as well as the academic dean. Modifications and refinements to the UT Tyler external review process are implemented as appropriate.
I. Program Overview

A. Department Purpose - include a brief history and description
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

B. Departmental Strategic Plan - include a detailed description of plans for the future and specifics on short-term and mid-range planning 1-5 years out
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

C. Alignment of program purpose and goals with institutional mission and strategic plan
   Appendix A: Ad hoc TracDat Report on Goal Alignment
   Resource: Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness – TracDat Report (Berman X5955)
   Request Time: 2 weeks

II. Program Administration

A. Administrative structure for the program (include a description of the context of the department within the college)
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

B. Administrative support staff for the program (include a description of the support staff within the program, department and/or college as appropriate)
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

III. Resources

A. Fiscal – Budget and expenditure totals for 3 years
   Appendix B: Annual Budgets for 3 most recent years
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

B. Facilities – Describe physical space available and needed (include a detailed description of plans for renovations, expansions, etc.)
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

C. Equipment – Describe equipment available and needed (include a detailed description of plans for replacing equipment that ensures the quality of instruction)
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

D. Technology – Describe technology available and needed (include a detailed description of plans for replacing technology that ensures the quality of instruction)
   Resource: Program
   Request Time: N/A

E. Library - Describe the library collections and services detailing adequacy of meeting the program, faculty and Student needs
   Resource: Library/Program
   Request Time: 1 month (Note: Library provides an extensive report that include basic composite information and discipline specific data.)

F. Student Support – Describe the student support services offered to help students achieve academic goals.
   Resource: Program / Student Life & Leadership / Academic Success / Writing Center / Math Lab
   Request Time: 1 month
IV. **Student Information** (Insert Table with last 3 years data)

- Enrollment
- Demographics (Gender, Ethnicity)
- Average Time to Degree – 6 Year Trend
- Retention Rates – 1 Year
- Graduation Rates – 6 Year Trend
- Number of Degrees Conferred Annually

  Resource: Program/Office of Institutional Analysis  
  Request Time: 1 month

V. **Quality of Instruction**

A. Table Summary of Student-Faculty Ratios for last 3 years  
   (Full-Time Equivalent/Student Full Time Equivalent)  
   Resource: Program  
   Request Time: N/A

B. Table Summary of End of Course evaluations for last 3 years for each faculty member  
   Resource: Program  
   Request Time: N/A

C. Student Performance - Table Summary of ongoing program improvement based on assessment results in last 3 years  
   Appendix C: Ad-hoc Assessment Reports and Curriculum Map(s) for most recent 3 years  
   Resource: Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness/Program  
   Request Time: 2 weeks

D. Table Summary of Graduate Licensure/Certifying Exam Rates for 3 years (if applicable)  
   Resource: Program  
   Request Time: N/A  
   Appendix F: Summative Reports from Licensure/Certifying Agency for 3 years

E. Table Summary of Graduate Placement (employment or further education/training) for last 3 years  
   Resource: Program/Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness /Career Services  
   Request Time: 2 weeks

F. Table Summary of Student Publications/Scholarship and Awards for last 3 years  
   Resource: Program/Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness  
   Request Time: 2 weeks

G. Table Summary of Program Curriculum and duration in comparison with peer programs (stated fixed time to degree based on fall semester enrollment) for last 3 years  
   Resource: Program/Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness  
   Request Time: 2 weeks

H. Other Measures of Quality including Program Dashboard  
   Resource: Program/Graduate School  
   Request Time: N/A
### VI. Faculty Qualifications and Productivity

#### A. Current Faculty Roster based in fall semester of the review year and previous 2 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### B. Number of Vacant Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Program Request Time: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### C. Faculty Teaching Loads

- Table Summary of Teaching Loads for last 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Program Request Time: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### D. Faculty Scholarship

- Table Summary of refereed publications, presentations, external grants for last 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Program Request Time: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### E. Faculty Service

- Table Summary of faculty service (University and Public/Community) for last 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Program/Faculty 180 Reports Request Time: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### F. Faculty Professional Development

- Table Summary of faculty professional development for last 3 years

| Resource | Program/Faculty 180 Reports Request Time: N/A |
Appendix B
An approval process for all external reviewers for master’s and doctoral programs is required effective January 1, 2017.

Nominations will be required for prospective external reviewers. Nominees should be scholars of appropriate rank or stature not affiliated with U.T. Tyler and must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review. Nominees should be considered based on particular reference to their records of subject-matter expertise within their respective discipline. External reviewers must be a member of a program nationally recognized for excellence in a higher education institution outside of Texas.

Individuals who may have a bias or perceived bias, such as co-authors, classmates, former students, research collaborators, former departmental colleagues, and friends should not serve as external reviewers.

The department chair should provide the names of at least two potential external reviewers to the college dean. The recommendations should include a statement of the nominee credentials and documentation that clarifies the nature of any prior contact the department chair has had with each suggested reviewer.

The college dean will likewise compile a list of at least two additional qualified reviewers with a statement of their credentials and documentation that clarifies the nature of any prior contact with each suggested reviewer. The college dean submits both lists of prospective reviewers to the Dean of the Graduate School who will determine the final selection in order of preference for participating in the external review. As not all reviewers will agree to participate the final list will contain no fewer than three names.

The Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness AVP will assist the department chair in contacting the prospective external reviewers in order of ranking to request their willingness to participate. The AIE office will coordinate with the department chair to provide the UT Tyler Memorandum of Agreement and the Supplier Information Form required of the finalist prior to conducting the review.

Reviewers will be provided with the program’s comprehensive self-study report and all related print and electronic documentation in compliance with Texas Administrative Code RULE §5.52 Review of Existing Programs.
Common Questions of a Peer Reviewer

To facilitate meaningful analysis of the evidence, it may be helpful to provide guiding questions to structure the self-study inquiry and report. These questions often produce deep discussions among faculty and are considered the most important aspect of the self-study and peer review process. Hence, a set of sample questions is embedded below within each of the core elements typically analyzed in the self-study report. Ideally, program evidence falls into two categories: evidence that addresses questions about program quality and evidence that addresses issues of program viability and sustainability.

I. Program Overview

Department History and Purpose – How are national trends and initiatives considered in the program’s planning processes? How does the program align with professional/business trends and practices? Does the Self-Study provide a sound analysis of strengths and areas for improvement? What evidence is provided that the program is increasing student access AND student success?

Future Goals and Planning for Improvement - What are the program’s goals for the next few years? Does the program review key outcome measures and performance indicators? Are the quality, use and analysis of program data assessed consistently? What is happening within the profession, local community or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future (including market research)? How will the program address any weaknesses identified in the self-study or build on existing strengths? What internal improvements are possible with existing resources? What improvements can be addressed only with additional resources? Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality and viability?

Alignment with Institutional Mission and Strategic Plan - Are the curriculum, practices, processes and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program and the institutional mission? What evidence is provided on strategic plan revisions and updates? What is the process for strategic initiative development and review?

Evidence in this category might include:

- A detailed narrative on goals for the next 1-5 years including descriptions of resources necessary for goal attainment
- Minutes or notes from department faculty meetings describing recommendations for improvement
- Minutes or notes from department faculty meetings describing recommendations on collaborations
- Evidence of program goals/outcomes aligning with institutional mission and strategic plan

II. Program Administration

The Administrative Environment - The administrative structure of the program should reflect the purposes for which it was established. Well-defined lines of authority with detailed duties and job descriptions should be followed. Policies and procedures should be followed to guide processes. Capable, credible, knowledgeable and experienced leadership is essential for success. Is there evidence of shared leadership that is innovative, inclusive accountable and flexible?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Organization chart
- Job Descriptions and detailed duties
- Demonstrated success of leading academic programs to promote student success
- Faculty/staff evaluations/surveys of direct supervisors and/or administrators

Staff – Does the current support staffing contribute to the quality of the program? Does support staff participate in systematic professional development opportunities that enhance the quality of the program directly? What is the professional development plan for each staff member for the next 1-3 years?

- Professional, Clerical and Technical staff FTE supporting program/departmental operations
- Professional, Clerical and Technical staff qualifications
- Professional, Clerical and Technical staff professional development plans
III. Allocation of Resources

**Financial resources** – Has the program experienced any significant changes in budget allocation that have impacted the quality of the program in any way? Is the program budget linked with strategic planning based data-driven decisions? Does the program demonstrate fiscal responsibility and cost effectiveness consistent with institutional protocols?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period

**Facilities** – Do the facilities meet the needs of the program? Are there any plans for modifications or renovations in the near future? Do facilities meet established standards for accessibility to persons with disabilities?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Classroom space
- Instructional laboratories
- Research laboratories
- Office space
- Student study spaces
- Access to classrooms suited for instructional technology
- Access to classrooms designed for alternative learning styles/universal design

**Equipment, Information and Technology resources** – Does the program have state-of-the-art equipment/technology that is comparable to what students will use in their chosen professions? Are the existing equipment, information and technology resources adequate to support the mission of the program? Do existing equipment, information and technology resources reflect current best pedagogical practices? Do resources meet established standards for delivery to persons with disabilities? What equipment, information and technology resources exist that are not used regularly by students and/or faculty and why? What equipment, information and technology resources might improve the quality of the programs?

Evidence in this category might include:

- A systematic plan for replacing equipment/technology to ensure state-of-the-art programming
- Library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program
- Information literacy outcomes for graduates
- Technology resources available to support the pedagogy and research in the program
- Technology resources available to support students’ needs

**Student Support** – What support services infrastructure is in place to help students graduate in a timely manner and experience academic success throughout the program? What student support services are available that students engage in the most? What student support services are available that students use infrequently or not at all and why? What student support services might be offered that are not currently provided? What resource requirements would be needed to accomplish providing new services? How does the program utilize distance education and other collaborative processes to promote investment in student access? How does the program ensure seamless transferability?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Academic and career advising programs and resources
- Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and Teaching Assistant training
- Basic skill remediation plans
- Support for connecting general learning requirements to discipline requirements
- Innovative use of technology to engage students in active learning
- Orientation and transition programs
- Financial support (scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.)
- Support for engagement in the campus community
- Support for non-cognitive variables of success, including emotional, psychological, and physical interventions if necessary
- Support for research or for engagement in the community beyond campus, such as fieldwork or internships
IV. Student Information

Students – What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the mission and goals of the program?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Students’ gender, ethnicity, age
- GPA from previous institution, types of previous institution
- Standardized test scores
- Student employment status
- Trends in numbers of student applications, admits, and enrollments reflected over a 3 year period

(Note that the specific list of indicators in this category will depend on the goals of the program)

V. Quality of Instruction

The assessment of the quality of instruction is the primary purpose of any self-study and external peer review. It is helpful to consider that program quality is multifaceted and assessment measures should include all components. While programs may have individual characteristics of excellence, all programmatic areas have identifiable commonalities that are necessary to guide decisions for program improvement. Additionally, the review process should consider the fundamental principles of “best practice” using well recognized and credible profession-wide standards specific to the discipline for quality assurance.

Evidence in this category might include:

- Student – Faculty Ratios by course type
- End of course evaluations
- Student academic performance – use of assessment results for program improvement
- Student performance on licensure/certifying examinations
- Graduate placement rates in employment or education settings
- Student awards and scholarship
- Comparison of peer programs

The Curriculum and Learning Environment – How current is the program curriculum? Does it offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular degree? How well does it align with learning outcomes? Are the courses well sequenced and reliably available in sequence? Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar programs? Is the level of program quality aligned with the college/university’s acceptable level of program quality? Are program goals being achieved? Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the expected level?

Evidence in this category might include:

- A curriculum flow chart and description of how the curriculum addresses the learning outcomes of the program (annual program assessment plan and curriculum map)
- A comparison of the program’s curriculum with curricula at selected other institutions and with disciplinary/professional standards
- Measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, faculty scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty)
- A description of other learning experiences that are relevant to program goals (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community-based learning, etc.), as well as how many students participate in those experiences
- A narrative that describes how the faculty’s pedagogy responds to various learning modalities

Student Learning and Success – Are students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? Are they achieving those outcomes at the expected level of learning and how is the expected level determined? Are they being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? Are they prepared for advanced study or the world of work?

Evidence in this category might include:
- Annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning in the program (could be combination of quantitative and qualitative measures), including the degree to which students achieve the program’s desired standards
- Ongoing efforts by the department to “close the loop” by responding to assessment results
- Student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories)
- Placement of graduates into graduate schools or post-doctoral experiences
- Job placements
- Graduating student satisfaction surveys (and/or alumni satisfaction surveys)
- Employer critiques of student performance or employer survey satisfaction results
- Disciplinary ratings of the program
- Student/Alumni achievements (e.g., community service, research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments, etc.)

VI. Faculty

Faculty – What is the profile of faculty in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the mission and goals of the program? Is support provided to ensure faculty may fulfill their professional expectations including excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and advising? Are professional development opportunities fostered both on campus and through travel? What professional development opportunities might be offered that are not currently provided?

Evidence in this category might include:

- Faculty workload
- Faculty review and evaluation processes
- Mentoring processes/programs
- Professional development opportunities/resources (including travel and research funds)
- Sufficient time for course development, research, etc.
- Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)

Appendix D
### Graduate Program Self Study Components and Resource Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Instl Analysis</th>
<th>AIE</th>
<th>Faculty 180</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>OSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Faculty qualifications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Faculty publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Faculty external grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Faculty teaching load (TLC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Faculty/student ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Student demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Student time-to-degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Student publication and awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Student retention rates (1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Student graduation rates (7 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Graduate licensure rates (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Graduate Placement (i.e. employment or further education/training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Number of degrees conferred annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Program facilities and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Program finance and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Program administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Career Services
APPENDIX E
AGREEMENT

This Agreement (this “Agreement”) is made this ______ day of ______________, 20____ by and between The University of Texas at Tyler, an institution and agency of higher education organized under the laws of the State of Texas located at 3900 University Boulevard, Tyler, TX 75799 (hereinafter "University") and ______________________, an individual whose address is ______________________ (hereinafter "External Program Reviewer").

WHEREAS, University has requested that External Program Reviewer review a graduate academic program or programs and External Program Reviewer has the credentials, experience, and capability to provide the services.

NOW, therefore, in consideration of the mutual promises and consideration recited herein, the parties agree as follows:

I. Scope of Services

External Program Reviewer will provide program review services for ______________________ as more particularly described in Attachment A on _____________, 20______.

II. Fee for Services; Expenses

a. In consideration for services performed by External Program Reviewer under this Agreement, University will pay to External Program Reviewer the sum of $_______ (the “Fee”). The Fee shall be paid in full by University check mailed to External Program Reviewer within ten (10) business days following completion of services.

b. University shall provide transportation from ______________________ to Tyler, TX and local ground transportation in Tyler, TX. The External Program Reviewer agrees and acknowledges that External Program Reviewer will be subject to the then-current Travel Reimbursement Rates promulgated by the Comptroller of Public Accounts for the State of Texas at https://fmx.cpa.state.tx.us/fm/travel/travelrates.php with regard to meals, mileage, lodging, and all other expenses related to travel except rental cars and airfare. Except as provided in this Agreement, External Program Reviewer agrees and acknowledges that External Program Reviewer will not be reimbursed by University for expenses that are prohibited or that exceed the allowable amounts set forth in the then-current Travel Reimbursement Rates. As a condition precedent to receiving reimbursement for expenses and disbursements, External Program Reviewer will submit to University receipts, invoices, and other documentation as requested by University. University shall remit payment within ten (10) business days of invoice receipt and approval.

c. University shall provide hotel accommodations for External Program Reviewer in Tyler, TX. External Program Reviewer shall be responsible for all incidental expenses (movies, beverages, snacks, etc.).
d. University shall reimburse External Program Reviewer for meals while traveling. External Program Reviewer shall invoice University and provide copies of meal receipts. University shall remit payment within ten (10) business days of invoice receipt and approval.

III. Relationship of the Parties

For all purposes of this Agreement and notwithstanding any provision of this Agreement to the contrary, External Program Reviewer is an independent contractor and is not an employee, partner, joint venturer, or agent of University. External Program Reviewer will not bind nor attempt to bind University to any agreement or contract. As an independent contractor, External Program Reviewer is solely responsible for all taxes, withholdings, and other statutory or contractual obligations of any sort, including but not limited to workers’ compensation insurance.

IV. Indemnification

UNIVERSITY SHALL, TO THE EXTENT AUTHORIZED UNDER THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, HOLD EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEWER HARMLESS FROM LIABILITY RESULTING FROM UNIVERSITY’S ACTS OR OMISSIONS WITHIN THE TERMS OF THIS AGREEMENT, PROVIDED, HOWEVER, UNIVERSITY SHALL NOT HOLD EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEWER HARMLESS FROM ANY CLAIMS, DEMAND, OR CAUSES OF ACTION ARISING IN FAVOR OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY, GROWING OUT OF, INCIDENTAL TO, OR RESULTING DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY FROM NEGLIGENCE OR WILLFUL MISCONDUCT (WHETHER SOLE, JOINT, CONCURRING, OR OTHERWISE) OF EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEWER, ITS OFFICERS, AGENTS, REPRESENTATIVES, OR EMPLOYEES, OR ANY PERSON OR ENTITY NOT SUBJECT TO UNIVERSITY’S SUPERVISION OR CONTROL.

V. Termination

This Agreement may be terminated for convenience at any time by either party upon providing ten (10) days’ written notice to the other party. Any such termination will be without prejudice to any obligations or liabilities of either party already accrued prior to such termination.

VI. Miscellaneous

Representations and Warranties by External Program Reviewer. If External Program Reviewer is a corporation or a limited liability company, External Program Reviewer warrants, represents, covenants, and agrees that it is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the state of its incorporation or organization and is duly authorized and in good standing to conduct business in the State of Texas, that it has all necessary power and has received all necessary approvals to execute and deliver this Agreement, and the individual executing this Agreement on behalf of External Program Reviewer has been duly authorized to act for and bind External Peer Reviewer.

Franchise Tax Certification. If External Program Reviewer is a corporation or limited liability company, External Program Reviewer certifies that it is not currently delinquent in the payment of any Franchise Taxes due under Chapter 171 of the Texas Tax Code, or that the corporation or limited liability company is exempt from the payment of such taxes, or that the corporation or limited liability
company is an out-of-state corporation or limited liability company that is not subject to the Texas Franchise Tax, whichever is applicable.

**Eligibility Certification.** Pursuant to Section 2155.004, Texas Government Code, External Program Reviewer certifies that the individual or business entity named in this Agreement is not ineligible to receive the award of or payments under this Agreement and acknowledges that this Agreement may be terminated and payment withheld if this certification is inaccurate.

**Payment of Debt or Delinquency to the State.** Pursuant to Sections 2107.008 and 2252.903, Texas Government Code, External Program Reviewer agrees that any payments owing to External Program Reviewer under this Agreement may be applied directly toward any debt or delinquency that External Program Reviewer owes the State of Texas or any agency of the State of Texas regardless of when it arises, until such debt or delinquency is paid in full.

**Texas Family Code Child Support Certification.** Pursuant to Section 231.006, Texas Family Code, External Program Reviewer certifies that it is not ineligible to receive the award of or payments under this Agreement and acknowledges that this Agreement may be terminated and payment may be withheld if this certification is inaccurate.

**Breach of Contract Claims.** To the extent that Chapter 2260, *Texas Government Code*, is applicable to this Agreement and is not preempted by other applicable law, the dispute resolution process provided for in Chapter 2260 and the related rules adopted by the Texas Attorney General pursuant to Chapter 2260, shall be used by University and External Program Reviewer to attempt to resolve any claim for breach of contract made by External Program Reviewer that cannot be resolved in the ordinary course of business. The Chief Business Officer of University shall negotiate with External Program Reviewer in an effort to resolve such claims. The parties hereto specifically agree that (i) neither the execution of this Agreement by University nor any other conduct, action or inaction of any representative of University relating to this Agreement constitutes or is intended to constitute a waiver of University’s or the state's sovereign immunity to suit; and (ii) University has not waived its right to seek redress in the courts.

**Notices.** Except as otherwise provided in this Section, all notices, consents, approvals, demands, requests or other communications provided for or permitted to be given under any of the provisions of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been duly given or served when delivered by hand delivery or when deposited in the U.S. mail by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows:

**If to University:** The University of Texas at Tyler
Office of Academic Affairs
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75799
Attention: Dr. Amir Mirmiran, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
With copy to: The University of Texas at Tyler
Office of Business Affairs
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75799
Attention: Mr. William “Bill” O’Donnell, Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Business Officer

If to External Program Reviewer:

Or such other person or address as may be given in writing by either party to the other in accordance with the aforesaid.

Notwithstanding any other requirements for notices given by a party under this Agreement, if External Program Reviewer intends to deliver written notice to University pursuant to Section 2251.054, Texas Government Code, then External Program Reviewer shall send that notice to University as follows:

The University of Texas at Tyler
Office of Academic Affairs
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75799
Attention: Dr. Amir Mirmiran, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fax: (903) 566-7007
Email: AMirmiran@uttyler.edu
With copy to: The University of Texas at Tyler
Office of Business Affairs
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75799
Attention: Mr. William “Bill” O’Donnell, Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Business Officer
Fax: (903) 566-7044
Email: wodonnell@uttyler.edu.

Or such other person or address as may be given in writing by University to External Program Reviewer in accordance with this Section.

State Auditor’s Office. External Program Reviewer understands that acceptance of funds under this Agreement constitutes acceptance of the authority of the Texas State Auditor’s Office, or any successor agency (collectively, “Auditor”), to conduct an audit or investigation in connection with those funds pursuant to Sections 51.9335(c), 73.115(c) and 74.008(c), Texas Education Code. External Program Reviewer agrees to cooperate with the Auditor in the conduct of the audit or investigation, including without limitation providing all records requested. External Program Reviewer will include this provision in all contracts with permitted subcontractors.

Venue; Governing Law. Smith County, Texas, shall be the proper place of venue for suit on or in respect of this Agreement. This Agreement and all of the rights and obligations of the parties hereto and all of the terms and conditions hereof shall be construed, interpreted and applied in accordance with and governed by and enforced under the laws of the State of Texas.

Entire Agreement; Modifications. This Agreement supersedes all prior agreements, written or oral, between External Program Reviewer and University and shall constitute the entire Agreement and understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof. This Agreement and each of its provisions shall be binding upon the parties and may not be waived, modified, amended or altered except by a writing signed by University and External Program Reviewer.

Ethics Matters; No Financial Interest. External Program Reviewer and its employees, agents, representatives and subcontractors have read and understand:

University’s Conflicts of Interest Policy available at: www.uttyler.edu/compliance/documents/UTTCOIpolicy.pdf
University’s Standards of Conduct Guide available at:


and applicable state ethics laws and rules available at:

[www.utsystem.edu/ogc/ethics](http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/ethics).

Neither External Program Reviewer nor its employees, agents, representatives or subcontractors will assist or cause University’s employees to violate University’s Conflicts of Interest Policy, provisions described by University’s Standards of Conduct Guide, or applicable state ethics laws or rules. External Program Reviewer represents and warrants that no member of the Board has a direct or indirect financial interest in the transaction that is the subject of the Agreement.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the date first written above.

**University**

By: __________________________
Name: Dr. Amir Mirmiran
Title: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Date: __________________________

**University**

By: __________________________
Name: Mr. William “Bill” O’Donnell
Title: Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Business Officer
Date: __________________________

**External Program Reviewer**

By: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
Date: __________________________
ATTACHMENT A
The University of Texas at Tyler
Scope of Graduate Program Reviews

External Review and Summary Report

Pre-Visit
The external reviewer should conduct a thorough assessment review using the program Self-Study Report, the program website and any other relevant support documentation as described in The University of Texas at Tyler Graduate Program External Review Guidelines and Procedures Handbook. Key performance indicators for review include the quality of the program and its faculty and students in relation to supporting the university mission, the identified primary issues of concern and priorities for development, how the program has demonstrated ongoing academic quality and how effectively the program’s proposed plans will prepare it for the future in relationship with aspirational national peers.

External Review and Summary Report
The external review summary report should focus on the findings and include accompanying recommendations. The reviewer should assess available faculty expertise, facilities, staff support, and the program structure and content in relationship to accepted norms. Each report should contain the following information:

a) A general description of the academic program and appropriateness to the UT Tyler mission.
b) A brief statement on the general process of the review, including a list of those who participated in the review. (Roster to be provided by the program)
c) Program strengths including quantitative and qualitative data.
d) Program challenges and opportunities including quantitative and qualitative data.
e) Recommendations for ongoing improvement emphasizing improved student success and academic achievement
f) Other information relevant to continuing improvement, as appropriate
g) The summary report should be provided to the department chair, the college dean and to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Graduate School no later than 30 days following the campus site visit.
h) If there is more than one reviewer, a single report signed by all participants should be submitted. Dissenting opinions should be included where consensus is lacking.
i) Reimbursement and fee for services will be processed upon completion of the summary report.
APPENDIX F
(a) In accordance with the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, each public institution of higher education shall have a process to review the quality and effectiveness of existing degree programs and for continuous improvement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(8) Institutions shall review masters and doctoral programs in the same discipline simultaneously, using the same self-study materials and reviewers. Institutions may also, at their discretion, review bachelor's programs in the same discipline as master's and doctoral programs simultaneously.
(9) Criteria for the review of doctoral programs must include, but are not limited to:

(A) The 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs;

(B) Student retention rates;

(C) Student enrollment;

(D) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);

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

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

(G) Program facilities and equipment;

(H) Program finance and resources;

(I) Program administration; and

(J) Faculty Qualifications.

(10) Institutions shall submit a report on the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewers and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 90 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(6) External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.
(7) Closely-related programs, defined as sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code, may be reviewed in a consolidated manner at the discretion of the institution.

(8) Master's programs in the same 6-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code as doctoral programs shall be reviewed simultaneously with their related doctoral programs.

(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 Affairs and Research Division no later than 90 days after the reviewer(s) have submitted their findings to the institution.
(11) Institutions may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.

(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.

Source Note: The provisions of this §5.52 adopted to be effective August 26, 2009, 34 TexReg 5678; amended to be effective November 29, 2010, 35 TexReg 10496; amended to be effective May 24, 2011, 36 TexReg 3183