



Academic Program Review

TAMIU

April 3, 2024

Introduction

Academic Program Review (APR) is an institution-wide evaluation process that incorporates systematic reviews of Texas A&M International University's (TAMIU) institutional goals and results in continuous improvement of program quality. Academic Program Review is an essential component of such institutional effectiveness. Every academic program is evaluated during the academic program process. The reviews of all academic programs are linked to graduate programs. State law (see Texas Administrative Code in the Appendix II) requires that all public doctoral programs and stand-alone master's programs be externally reviewed on a 10-year cycle. Texas A&M International University has elected to review all degree programs, including bachelor's degrees, within the scope of the Academic Program Review (APR). Programs reviewed by an external accrediting body are not part of the formal APR process described here. However, the findings of any external accrediting body should be submitted to the Provost's office as evidence of compliance with Texas Administrative Code for the accredited program.

The APR process, coordinated in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, aligns with, and complements, existing measures for assessment and quality enhancement. It facilitates discussion about change and strategies for improvement, and it provides the basis for making strategic decisions based on an extensive review from various constituents. APR is an opportunity to realign actions with current priorities of the university, colleges, departments, and programs as these are articulated in mission statements and strategic plans. APR underpins the process of achieving the university's goal of continuously improving the quality of all academic programs in the pursuit of excellence.

APR Administrative Team

The APR Administrative Team provides a university perspective for reviews and programs undergoing review. The APR team regularly discusses program reviews during scheduled Dean's Council meetings. This APR team consists of:

Associate Vice Provost
Director of Institutional Research
Dean, ARSSB
Dean, COAS

Dean, COED
Dean, CNHS
Dean, Graduate School
Dean, University College

In the academic program review process, the college dean is responsible for hosting entry and exit meetings and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible for submitting the institutional response to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) for graduate programs. The office of the Provost is responsible for coordinating the 10-year review cycle with the THECB, colleges, departments, and programs, assisting with self-study development, and reviewing self-studies before submission to the THECB.

The college dean is responsible for:

- Approving the program's nomination of peer reviewers
- Reviewing and approving self-study
- Meeting with the external reviewer
- Participating in the post-review meeting

Program Review Timeframe

Date	Action
March 1	Department Chairs will be informed of ensuing program review(s) Program Directors/Department Chairs will generate list of external reviewers
April 15	List of External Reviewer will be delivered to the college dean for review Self-study process should commence
September 15	Self-Study due to college dean College dean submits self-study to external review team Site visit plans are developed
November 1-15	Site visit completed before 11/15
December 1-15	External review final report is due to TAMIU
February 1	Initial program response is due to the chair/dean Post-review meeting
March 1	Final Program Review (self-study, external review final report, and final program response) is due to the dean/Office of the Provost
April 1	Submit Final Program Review to THECB

External Review Team

The external review team participates in and conducts the site visit. The role of the external review team is to ensure the integrity of the academic program review, provide valid feedback

regarding the status of the program and make recommendations for improvement. The external review members will receive a \$1,500 professional fee and will be reimbursed for all travel-related expenses by the college office of the dean upon completion and transmittal of the final report to the college Dean and the Provost.

External Review Team Charge

- Based on the information provided in the self-study report and gathered by the review team during its campus visit, what are the programs' overall strengths and weaknesses?
- How well do the programs' focus and learning outcomes align with the strategic academic goals and priorities of the department, college(s), and those of Texas A&M International University?
- How would you compare the program(s) reviewed with those offered by peers? Specifically, do the curriculum, the identified learning outcomes, and overall program outcomes align with similar programs offered at peer institutions? If not, are unique characteristics of the program(s) reviewed a strength or area of concern?
- With only current resources or a modest infusion of new ones, what specific recommendations could improve the programs' performance, marginally or significantly?

The external review team will be asked to complete a report that asks about each section covered in the self-study and the information obtained from the onsite visit.

External Review Team Make-Up

The External Review Team (ERT) is an essential element to the Academic Review Process. At TAMIU the ERT will vary by level of the program (graduate or undergraduate). Undergraduate and masters programs will include at least one external reviewer. Doctoral program reviews will have at least two external reviewers. Undergraduate reviews will be completed by the same team that reviewed the graduate program.

Regardless of the number of members of the ERT, these reviewers should be from institutions of higher education outside the state of Texas. Additionally, external reviewers must be subject-matter experts who have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

The Self-Study Document

The Program's faculty prepare the self-study prior to review. This study provides detailed information about the program and includes an assessment of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The self-study is the faculty's opportunity for self-evaluation and reflection both on historical data (the past five years) as well as a strategic path forward (the next five years). Programs are encouraged to commit themselves to specific, long-range planning in the self-study. An analysis of each major section of the self-study helps reviewers put the

program data into context within the college and larger institution.

The self-study document can be found [\[redacted\]](#).

The program's self-study will be the external reviewer's primary source of information. In addition to presenting the information requested in tables, charts and narratives, the program should complete each section with an analysis.

Organize the self-study report according to the order of required items as listed.

Most of the sections of the self-study denoted below are required by the State of Texas (see "Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs" and Texas Administrative Code Rule § 5.52). Some of the data required for graduate programs are not required for undergraduate programs. Additional information will be embedded in the template listed above.

1. Executive Summary of the Self-Study Report (1-2 pages)

- Overview of the program(s) to be included in the APR
- Overview of the number of faculty and students across programs for the current academic year

2. Department Overview and Infrastructure

Briefly describe each of the following:

- Mission and strategic plan
 - Include a summary of the strategic priorities for the department, the college/school, and the University as they relate specifically to academic programs
- Leadership of the department
- External program accreditations (if applicable)
- Facilities supporting the program(s) included in the APR, including space and equipment used for the delivery of the programs and related activities (e.g., research)
- Finances related to academic programs(s)

At a minimum, supporting documents should include the following:

- Institutional Summary – provided by the APR Coordinator
- Department Strategic Plan (if available)
- School/College Strategic Plan

3. Academic Program(s) Overview

- List the academic degree programs to be addressed in the APR
- Identify peer and aspirant programs

- Summarize the curriculum by program, including program learning outcomes
- Describe how the curriculum is appropriate for the level and type of degree awarded by the program
- Specify the admissions criteria (by program)
- Provide the number of degrees awarded per year (based on the most recent 5 years) and average time to degree (based on the most recent 5 years) by program

At a minimum, supporting documents should include the following:

- A summary of the program curriculum for each program; documents might include the catalog description of the program and curricular requirements or sample degree plans from the most recent academic year.

4. Summary of the last APR if applicable (if this is the first APR review for the programs in the department, note this in this section)

- Provide the date of the last review and list the members of the external review team
- Summarize the recommendations and actions taken to date based on the recommendations, with particular attention to the last 2-3 years since the submission of the last Status Report
- Provide a summary of any significant structural or curricular changes to programs offered since the last review (e.g., new programs, program phaseouts, changes to mode of delivery, changes to the administrative location of the programs)

At a minimum, supporting documents should include the following:

- The last External Review Report
- The Institutional Summary submitted to the THECB
- The 1-Year Status Report
- The 5-Year Status Report

5. Program Assessment (by program)

- Learning Outcomes
- Provide the strategies used to assess identified learning outcomes (as outlined in Section 3)
- Summarize the results from previous student learning outcome assessments
- Discuss 1-3 improvements made based on results of the program's assessment of learning outcomes (by program) over the last 2-3 years
- Program Outcomes (for the previous 5 years, by program)
- Provide data on the identified program outcomes, to include but not limited to the following:
 - Retention rates
 - Number of degrees per year
 - Graduate rates
 - Average time to degree

- Student publications/presentations
- Discuss the degree program's progress and efforts related to retention and graduation rate, time to degree, degrees awarded and placement upon graduation

6. Student Profile

- Provide the following data for the last 5 academic years (based on fall semester data) by academic program included in the current APR:
 - Enrollment by academic year, including % of full-time students
 - Student demographics (gender, ethnicity, domestic vs. international, first generation) by level (e.g., baccalaureate, masters, doctoral)
 - Average institutional support provided for graduate students by program/year (e.g., first year master's students, first year doctoral students)
 - Number of applied, admitted, and enrolled students by program
 - Percentage of full-time students with institutional financial support
 - Employment profile (in field/discipline within one year of graduation)
- Analysis: Discuss the degree program's contribution to the mission of the university as described in the Strategic Plan. Discuss any discernable trends in the data, including efforts undertaken to address any identified deficiencies.

Additional information could include:

- Average SAT/GRE scores for entering students
- Average GPA for enrolled students by program
- Comparisons with similar programs offered across the college/school or among the identified peer/aspirant programs

7. Faculty Profile

- Name (with CV)
- Number of faculty (tenure/tenure track/full-time/adjunct)
- Faculty-student ratio
- Faculty publications (most recent 5 years), total number
- External grants (most recent 5 years) with amounts awarded (dollars)
- Average teaching load
- Faculty demographics
 - Gender
 - Race
 - Ethnicity
 - Rank
 - % with terminal degree
 - Highest degree earned
 - Summary of teaching/research areas of specialization

8. Program Priorities and Opportunities for Improvement

- What opportunities for improvement did the program faculty identify?
- What priorities did the program faculty develop?
- Are there any specific areas for which the program faculty is particularly interested in External Reviewer feedback/guidance?

Any data collected for self-study reports will only cover the previous five-year period. Examples of data include:

Student Data

- Student enrollment by degree program
- Student demographics (gender, ethnicity, domestic vs international) by level
- Average SAT/GRE scores and GPA for enrolled students by level; also compared to the average for the affiliated academic college (by semester and academic year)
- Degrees awarded by degree program
- Number of applied/admitted/enrolled students for degree program by degree program and by level (fall semesters only)
- Average time to degree by degree program (by academic year)
- Average retention rates by degree program (by academic year)
- First time in college by Texas high school

Faculty Data

- Average annual faculty salary by rank (by academic year converted to nine-month salaries); this will include full-time faculty only and will be divided among tenured/tenure-track individuals and non-tenure-track individuals
- Average faculty salary by rank relative to TAMIU, and relative to peer institutions comparable degree programs; this will include full-time faculty only
- Faculty demographics (gender, ethnicity, age) by rank (divided by full time and part-time)
- Teaching load per faculty rank by level (by academic year)
- Faculty to student ratio; also compared to other degree programs within the affiliated academic college

Other Data

- Semester credit hours taken by major (regardless of degree program) by level (by academic year)
- Semester credit hours taught in degree program courses (regardless of major of student taking the course) by level (by academic year)
- Courses taken by major
- History of courses taught
- Outside-degree program students by gender and level
- Outside-degree program students summary by gender and level

The self-study must be signed by the individual who completes the document, the department chair, and the college dean.

External Reviewer(s) Site Visit

External reviewers are responsible for making their own travel arrangements, but TAMIU will cover all costs associated with the travel to Laredo. The program/department/college is responsible for ground transportation, meals, and lodging when the external reviewer arrives in Laredo.

For a one-and-a-half-day schedule, external reviewers arrive in Laredo by 6:00 p.m. on the first day of the review and will depart the afternoon of the final day of the review. The site visit consists of Entry/Exit Interviews with the APR Administrative Team (or designees), various meetings with the dean of the college (or designee), department chair/program director, faculty members and students, and tours of degree program facilities. Below is a sample itinerary. *This is only a suggested itinerary.*

DAY 1

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 2:00-6:00 pm | External Reviewer arrives in Laredo |
| 7:00-9:00 pm | Welcome dinner hosted by the department chair/program director. Orientation/background will be provided at this time. Department chairs, program directors, and critical personnel should be at this dinner. |

DAY 2

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 7:30-8:30 am | Breakfast |
| 9:00-10:00 am | Meeting with college dean |
| 10:00-10:30 am | Meet with department chair/program coordinator |
| 11:00a-12:00 pm | Meet with faculty committees |
| 12:00-1:00 pm | Lunch |
| 1:00-2:00 pm | Meet with faculty in sub-disciplines |
| 2:00-3:00 pm | Meet with students |
| 3:00-4:00 pm | Meet with department chairs/program coordinators within the same college |
| 4:00-6:00 pm | Tour campus/facilities |
| 6:00-9:00 pm | Dinner/reflection time |

DAY 3

8:00-9:15 am	Exit meeting with Provost and dean
9:30-10:30 am	Debrief department chair and/or program coordinator
10:30-11:30 am	Debrief faculty, staff, and students on final report
12:00 pm	Lunch/depart as applicable

External Review Response Document

Once the external review team completes the site visit, and based on state reporting requirements, the external reviewer(s) will be asked to submit the Final Report within one (1) month of the conclusion of the campus visit/review. The external reviewer(s) must sign the external reviewer response document.

The external review final report(s) on the degree program(s) will be forwarded to the Department Chair or Program Director and the college dean; members of the APR Administrative Team will be forwarded the final external report upon receipt from the chair. The chair or coordinator will have 30 days to provide a draft written response on the external review final report to the dean, based on input and discussion with program faculty. Following preliminary agreement by the program to the proposed actions, the department chair/program coordinator will submit the preliminary program response to the college dean no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled post-review meeting.

At a minimum, responses and approved actions are required for any issues identified in the external review final report as “Needs Improvement.” Responses to other recommendations provided by the external reviewer are strongly encouraged.

This response form must be signed by the individual who completed the response, the department chair/program coordinator, and the college dean.

Post-Review Meeting and Reporting

After the process is complete, the department/program must come together to discuss the cumulative meaning of the process, identify opportunities for enhancing the program, and strengths to build on. The goal of the post-review process is to finalize actions to be taken in response to recommendations by the ERT (particularly as they relate to issues noted as “Needs Improvement”). Post-review consists of a post-review meeting and submission of the final Program Response Form. This should be the focus of an entire regular department/program meeting.

The post-review meeting, typically held **30-45 days following the site visit**, includes the entire department/program, the department chair, the college dean (and/or designee), and an additional member of the APR Administrative Team. The post-review meeting provides the department/program the opportunity to present the Program Response and finalize actions to be taken. The final Program Review, including self-study, external review, and program response are to be submitted to the college dean no later than **four (4) weeks following the post-review meeting**.

The college dean will then transmit the program review(s) to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. For graduate programs, the final Program Review including self-study, external review, and program response, will be transmitted to the THECB for review. This closes the program review process.

Programs Going Through the Accreditation Process

For programs going through the accreditation process by a national/regional accrediting body within their fields, the above program review process will deviate by the standards of the accrediting body. Provided the same kinds of information are provided to the accrediting body with a self-study, external reviewer(s) report, and program response, this information will be submitted to the THECB for graduate program. Undergraduate programs under accreditation review will be archived at the department and college levels.

Appendix I

Program Review Schedule

Year	Program	Degree Titles
2021	Graduate	MA English, MS Criminal Justice, MPA Public Administration
	Undergraduate	BAAS/BAAS CJ, BA/BS CJ, BA CJ & Political Science, BA English
2022	Graduate	MA Political Thought
	Undergraduate	BA History, BA History/Political Science, BA Political Science
2023	Graduate	MS Math, MS Nurse Administration, MS Nurse Practitioner
	Undergraduate	BS Kinesiology Cert., BA/BS Math
2024	Graduate	MS Biology, MS Bilingual Education, MA Teaching, MS Special Education
	Undergraduate	BA/BS Biology, BS Chemistry, BS Science 7-12 Certification, BSIS (all tracks), BS Comm. Disorders, BS Elementary Ed. (Bilingual, Spec. Ed. & Early Learning), BA Art
2025	Graduate	MA Communication, MA Counseling Psychology, MS Psychology
	Undergraduate	BA Communication, BA Psychology
2026	Graduate	MS Ed. Admin., MS C&I, MS School Counseling
	Undergraduate	BA MDS, Bachelors in Music
2027	Graduate	MS Information Science, MA Language, Literature, and Translation
	Undergraduate	BBA MIS, BA Sociology, BA Spanish
2028	Graduate	MBA (all concentrations), PhD Intl. Bus. Admin., MPA Professional Accountancy
	Undergraduate	BBA Business Admin., BBA Accounting, BAAS Business
2029	Graduate	MS Computer Engineering
	Undergraduate	BS Computer, Petroleum, & Systems Engineering

Appendix II

Texas Administrative Code

Title 19, Chapter 5

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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:
 1. The Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs;

2. Student retention rates;
 3. Student enrollment;
 4. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);
 5. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;
 6. Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;
 7. Program facilities and equipment;
 8. Program finance and resources;
 9. Program administration; and
 10. 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.
4. 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 Workspace.
 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 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:
 1. Faculty qualifications;
 2. Faculty publications;
 3. Faculty external grants;
 4. Faculty teaching load;

5. Faculty/student ratio;
 6. Student demographics;
 7. Student time-to-degree;
 8. Student publication and awards;
 9. Student retention rates;
 10. Student graduation rates;
 11. Student enrollment;
 12. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);
 13. Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training);
 14. Number of degrees conferred annually;
 15. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;
 16. Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;
 17. Program facilities and equipment;
 18. Program finance and resources;
 19. 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.
5. 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.