

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Academic Program Review Guidelines

I. Introduction

Texas Administrative Code Rule 5.52 requires each public institution of higher education have a process to review the quality and effectiveness of existing degree programs for continuous improvement. Further, all public doctoral programs and stand-alone master's programs must be externally reviewed on a ten-year cycle. Texas A&M University-Kingsville (TAMUK) has elected to review all degree programs on the same ten-year cycle. Programs that are periodically reviewed by an external professional accrediting agency may be exempt from the TAMUK program review process upon demonstration that the program has met, through that accreditation process, the requirements of the TAMUK program review. Exemptions are contingent on fully positive accreditation reviews; partial/probationary accreditation or denial of accreditation will not qualify for an exemption. Reports from these external accreditations satisfy state reporting requirements and are kept on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

The program review process at TAMUK, coordinated by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, is an integral component of institutional effectiveness, which is defined as "ongoing, comprehensive, and integrated research-based planning and evaluation" that involves systematic review and results in continuous improvement (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 7.1, Principles of Accreditation).

The program review process 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 decisions using solid information. It 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. It underpins the process of achieving the university's goal of continuously improving the quality of all academic programs in the pursuit of excellence.

The Office of Academic Affairs looks forward to assisting you with the program review process. Programs scheduled for review are contacted approximately one year in advance by the Provost & Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee to allow ample time to prepare for the review. The process is initiated with an introductory meeting between the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA), the department, and interested college representatives to convey expectations and provide tools to prepare for the review. The entire review process includes completion of a self-study, an external review site visit, a final report, a departmental or program response, an institutional response, and one- and four-year status reports that document actions and results.

II. The Academic Program Review Process

1. Selecting the External Review Team

An important task for the program is to develop a list of five to six potential reviewers. We strive to select professionally prominent individuals for the review process. The peer reviewers are usually from

academia, but occasionally can be drawn from business or government. Nominees are usually nationally recognized in their respective field. The department should contact potential reviewers initially to ascertain availability and interest before forwarding the nomination memo and list to the Provost. Departments should coordinate their nominees through the respective Dean. The nomination list is submitted to the Provost, through the Dean, AVPAA and the Dean of Graduate Studies (Graduate Program reviews only). The AVPAA will invite the reviewers approved by the Provost. The memorandum forwarding the list of potential reviewers will contain the following information (see Resources):

- Preferred potential reviewers and alternates ranked in order of preference
- Complete job title/ rank, and name of a reviewer's department
- Nominee's principal area of scholarly activity (related to department being reviewed)
- Name of university or organization
- Contact information (full mailing address, e-mail, and telephone number)
- Preference for chair of review team (top 2 choices)

The team should be a diverse group of individuals with majority representation from schools identified as either peers or aspirant peers of Texas A&M University-Kingsville. In addition, the team should have experience with undergraduate and graduate programs, and with the teaching, research, and engagement or service components of the discipline as appropriate. Specific guidance will be provided to the department by the AVPAA regarding the Provost's wishes for each review team. A team member who participated in a previous review is recommended, but not required. Review team members selected from the list of potential reviewers will be chosen according to the following criteria:

1. Number of reviewers per team:
 - a. Individual programs (ie. Bachelor's only) = 2 reviewers total
 - b. Combined programs (ie. Bachelor's and Master's) = 3 reviewers total
2. External reviewers must be employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas.
3. External reviewers must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline; they will be asked to benchmark Texas A&M University-Kingsville programs with their peer and aspirant peer programs based on discipline-specific rankings and other publicly available comparisons.
4. External reviewers must affirm that no conflict of interest exists related to the program under review.

2. Self-Study Report

The program's faculty prepares a descriptive and evaluative self-study prior to review. This study provides basic information about the program and includes an assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) to the program. The self-study is the faculty's opportunity for self-evaluation. The standard timeframe for the data included in the self-study is the five previous years. The self-study must be completed and submitted to the external review team and Provost's office no less than one month before the site visit. The Executive Summary of the Self-Study is forwarded as required to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) by the AVPAA.

Programs with degrees at multiple levels (ie. Bachelors and Masters) will complete a single self-study report. However, the program faculty must take special care to distinguish the different levels in the self-study. All data and analysis must be disaggregated by level and a separate executive summary must be written for each level.

An emphasis for the program and reviewers should be the future. Programs are encouraged to commit themselves to specific, long-range planning in the self-study. The program review not only assesses the current status but is forward-looking and directed toward improvement.

3. External Review Site Visit

External reviewers will be in Kingsville for a minimum of 2 days for the site visit. The site visit consists of Entry/Exit Interviews with the AVPAA, various meetings with the Dean of College (or designee), Department Chair and/or Program Coordinator, faculty members, students, and tours of department/program facilities. (See Resources for Sample Itinerary.)

4. Final Report

The Final Report-Review Team

Once the review team completes the site visit, the review team has 21 days to transmit the final report to the AVPAA at provost@tamuk.edu. The following format for the review report is recommended:

- Preamble
- Status of the Program
- Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program
- Opportunities for and Threats to the Program
- Evaluation of Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans
- Recommendations

The final report should also provide answers to the following queries:

- Is the program advancing the discipline/profession?
- Based upon the evidence provided, is the student learning effective?
- Does the program meet its goals and those of Texas A&M University-Kingsville?
- Does the program respond to the needs of the profession?
- How is the program viewed by experts in the field?

5. Program Response

The AVPAA will forward the external review team's final report to the department chair, the Dean, and other relevant parties upon receipt. The department chair will share the report with the faculty and provide the opportunity for discussion. The program has 14 days to provide a written response on the

external review team's report, to the AVPAA. In responding, the program must document actions planned to address the external review team's report findings.

6. Post-Review Reporting

The goal of the post-review process is continuous institutional improvement as a result of the program review. Post-review consists of a post-review meeting, submission of a post-review summary, and submission of both 1-year and 4-year status reports.

The Post-Review Meeting

The post-review meeting is held approximately 60 days after the site visit. This meeting is led by the Department Chair and attended by the AVPAA and the program faculty. The Department Chair may invite other department or college personnel as appropriate. The post-review meeting provides the Department Chair the opportunity to present and discuss the program response and the proposed actions based on the external review. The AVPAA, College Dean, and Department Chair will subsequently reach consensus on what actions are to be taken, by whom, and in what time frame.

The Post-Review Summary (Institutional Response)

The outcomes of the Post-Review meeting will be outlined in a Post-Review Summary (Institutional Response) from the Provost to the Dean and Department Chair, with copies to the AVPAA. The Provost's Office will submit the Post-Review Summary (Institutional Response) to the THECB, as required. The post-review summary includes actions to be taken and discussion of any resources necessary for implementing the plan.

1-Year Status Report

Approximately one year after the site visit, the program submits to the AVPAA, a 1-Year Status Report addressing actions taken as discussed in the Post-Review meeting and the Executive Summary. The AVPAA forwards the 1-year status report to the external review team for their information.

4-Year Status Report

Approximately four years after the site visit, the program sends to the AVPAA a status report on actions taken and results of changes implemented as a result of program review as outlined in the Post-Review Summary. As the conclusion to the program review process, the AVPAA forwards the 4-year status report to the external review team for their information.

III. Responsibilities

This section outlines the specific duties of the Office of the Provost, the College of Graduate Studies, the academic College, the program under review, and the individual reviewers.

Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President

The Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President has ultimate authority over the program review process. The AVPAA provides a university perspective for review teams and programs undergoing review. Additional responsibilities of the Office of the Provost include, but are not limited to:

- Coordinating the ten-year review cycle in consultation with the THECB
- Scheduling annual program review dates in consultation with the program
- Approving nominations of external reviewers
- Facilitating entry and exit interviews during on-site reviews
- Providing funding for most review-related expenses (see Resources)
- Approving departmental response to the review team's final report
- Approving and distributing 1- and 4-year status reports
- Communicating results of each review to the President of TAMUK
- Communicating results of each review to the THECB
- Overseeing implementation of review recommendations and planned actions
- Refining the program review process as needed

The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs works directly with programs undergoing review to assist with preparations for the review and with monitoring progress throughout the entire review cycle. The specific responsibilities of the AVPAA are detailed below:

- Assisting with scheduling annual program reviews
- Coordinating introductory meetings to initiate the review process
- Extending formal invitations to potential reviewers on behalf of the Provost
- Providing background material to deans, department chairs, and review teams
- Reserving review team lodging
- Compiling a welcome packet with an itinerary for the review team
- Maintaining all official review files
- Tracking and distributing review documents

College of Graduate Studies

The College of Graduate Studies works with the Office of the Provost to provide support and guidance to programs undergoing review. They help ensure that reviews of degree programs and other educational and teaching priorities, faculty expertise and research priorities, and service and outreach programs are appropriate to the individual program undergoing review. Other responsibilities include:

- Reviewing program nominations for external reviewers
- Participating in entry and exit interviews during on-site reviews
- Providing requested resources for review teams
- Attending post-review meetings
- Reviewing and providing input on post-review documents

The Colleges

The Dean, together with the AVPAA, supports college efforts that are part of program reviews, approves the 10-year schedule of programs to be reviewed, approves the program's nomination of peer reviewers,

participates in the external review team's exit meeting with the Provost, meets as appropriate with the reviewers during the site visit, meets with the program at the post-review meeting, provides input on any follow-up correspondence from the department, and monitors strategies and outcomes in response to the program review process.

The Programs

The principal effort and responsibility for the program review resides in the program under review. The program is strongly encouraged to communicate and coordinate with their Dean and the AVPAA for continual input on all aspects of the review. (See Resources for an overview of Program Responsibilities & Timelines).

The External Review Team

The external review team participates in and conducts the site visit. The role of the 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 \$1000 professional fee, and will be reimbursed for all travel-related expenses by the Office of the Provost, upon completion and transmittal of the final report to the Provost.

Responsibilities of the Review Team Chair

- Contact other members of the team before arrival to Texas A&M University-Kingsville to discuss roles and responsibilities.
- Submit preliminary draft report of findings to Provost at the Exit meeting.
- Submit the signed Final Report of findings to the AVPAA within 21 days after site visit

Responsibilities of the Review Team

- Participate in entry and exit interviews with the AVPAA and the Dean.
- Conduct separate exit briefing for Department Chair and faculty, including staff and students.
- Conduct a thorough review of the program, its students, and its teaching, research, and service or engagement activities, as appropriate.

IV. Resources: APR Administrative Team

Dr. James M. Palmer
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Phone: 361-593-3106
Email: james.palmer@tamuk.edu

Dr. Darin Hoskisson
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Phone: 361-593-2170
Email: darin.hoskisson@tamuk.edu

IV. Resources: Contents of Self-Study Report

The program's written Self-Study report will be your external review team's primary source of information. In addition to presenting the information requested in tables, charts, and narratives, please respond to the analysis question(s) at the end of each section, as indicated below. Plan to organize your Self-Study report according to the order of required items as listed. Approval to add or delete any questions or sections must be requested through the Dean to the Provost.

Programs with degrees at multiple levels (ie. Bachelors and Masters) will complete a single self-study report. However, the program faculty must take special care to distinguish the different levels in the self-study. All data and analysis must be disaggregated by level and a separate executive summary must be written for each level.

Many of the items below and their definitions are specified by the State of Texas (see "18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs" and Texas Administrative Code Rule § 5.52). Much of the relevant data will be provided to the program by TAMUK's Office of Institutional Research. The department is the best source for some information, such as learning outcomes and assessments, departmental evaluation metrics for faculty performance evaluation, and resources for responding to the analysis questions. Please contact the AVPAA if you need guidance in gathering information.

- **Executive Summary of the Self-Study Report (1-2 pp)**
- **Introduction to Program**
 - Brief program history
 - Mission and goals
 - Administrative structure (department and program)
 - Department and program resources
 - Facilities (including space and equipment)
 - Finances and resources
 - External program accreditations (if applicable)
 - Date of last program review external review (if applicable)
 - Analysis:
 - Describe the alignment of department or program strategic goals and priorities with institutional goals and priorities. Attach the program's or department's current strategic plan or, if unavailable, the strategic plan for the college.
 - List and briefly discuss 1-3 improvements made since the previous program review and describe the results of those improvements.
- **Academic Programs and Curricula**
 - Programs offered
 - Program curricula (including duration and comparisons to peers)
 - Admissions criteria and the process for reviewing and updating
 - Number of degrees awarded per year (most recent 5 years)
 - Average time to degree (most recent 5 years)

- Academic enhancements / high-impact opportunities for students
- Assessment of student learning outcomes
- Analysis: Briefly discuss improvements made based as a result of the program's assessment of student learning outcomes.
- Analysis: Discuss how the curriculum for a graduate degree demands more rigor and higher-order learning than undergraduate work in the same field (if applicable).
- Analysis: Briefly describe how any online programs adhere to the *Principles of Good Practice* (if applicable).
- **Faculty Profile**
 - Core faculty (defined as full-time, tenured and tenure-track)
 - Number
 - Core faculty / student ratio
 - Publications (most recent 5 years)
 - External grants (most recent 5 years)
 - Teaching load
 - Faculty other than core (as defined above)
 - Number
 - Faculty / student ratio
 - Publications
 - External grants
 - Teaching load
 - Faculty diversity
 - Faculty qualifications
 - Analysis: Using the department's standards (i.e., Annual Evaluation for faculty teaching, research, professional development, and service as submitted to the provost, as well as other relevant data such as annual reviews and Academic Analytics or other benchmark services), discuss the faculty's overall performance.
- **Student Profile**
 - Enrollment, including % of full-time students vs. part-time
 - Student diversity/demographics
 - Retention rates (most recent 5 years)
 - Graduation rates (most recent 5 years)
 - Average time to degree (most recent 5 years)
 - Average institutional financial support provided
 - % of full-time students with institutional financial support
 - Employment profile (in field within one year of graduation; most recent 5 years)
 - Graduate placement/employment
 - Licensure rates (if applicable)
 - Student publications/presentations/awards (most recent 5 years)
 - Student professional development (including graduate student preparation for teaching, where applicable)
 - Analysis: Based on the student data provided, discuss any changes in enrollment numbers. How has the program responded to these changes in enrollment (positive

or negative)? What are the plans to ensure positive enrollment growth in the program going forward?

- **Concluding Observations**

IV. Resources: Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Data provided will cover the most recent 5-year period and will include the information summarized below. Note that some reports will vary based on structure of program, as well as the quality of data available.

Student Data

- Student enrollment (full-time and part-time) by degree program (by semester and academic year)
- Student demographics (gender, ethnicity, domestic vs international) by level (by semester and academic year)
- Average ACT/SAT/GRE/GMAT 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 (by semester and academic year)
- Number of applied/admitted/enrolled students for department 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

- 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 departments within the affiliated academic college (fall semesters only)

Other Data

- Semester credit hours taken by major (regardless of department) by level (by semester and academic year)
- Semester credit hours taught in department courses (regardless of major of student taking the course) by level (by semester and academic year)
- Outside-Department Students by Level (course, major and number of hours)
- Grade Distribution (courses within the major)
- # of students who do not return (changed major or left the university)
- Mode of delivery for major courses

IV. Resources: Program Responsibilities and Timeline

Responsibilities	Approximate Time Frame	Comments & Reference
Choose Review Dates	10 months prior	Selected with input from the AVPAA
Nominate Potential Members for the External Review Team	9 months prior	Memo Routing: TO: Provost; THROUGH: AVPAA and Dean of Graduate Studies and College Dean; FROM: Department Chair. Submit a list (in order of preference) of 5-6 potential reviewers with complete contact information, job title, affiliate university, area of scholarly research, and a brief 1-2 sentences justifying nomination. Also, indicate top two preferences for review team chair. (p. 13)
Organize & Initiate Self Study	7-9 months prior	See "Self-Study"(pp. 3-4, 8-9)
Submit the "Charge to the External Review Team"	6-7 months prior	Once the review team is finalized, the department will need to provide the AVPAA with the "Charge to the External Review Team". It should briefly cover the program overview and degrees offered (p. 15-16)
Communicate with the External Review Team	6 months prior	After the review team is confirmed, the Department Chair should communicate, with the external review team about travel and timelines.
Develop Itinerary	2 months prior	See "Sample Itinerary" (p. 17-18)
Reserve Meeting Rooms	2 months prior	Reserve meeting spaces for all meetings with the exception of the Entry, Exit, and Post-Review meetings with the Provost. If available, the department may set up a room to allow as office space for the reviewers.
Arrange Transportation	2 months prior	Department is responsible for arranging transportation for reviewers. Reviewers are also free to arrange their own travel. See "Transportation" for more details. (p. 18-19)
Arrange Campus and Facility Tours	1month prior	Tours should be given of any major facility, centers, labs, etc. associated with the program review.
Arrange Meals & Reception for Review Team	1month prior	See "Sample Itinerary" and "Meals" for more details. (pp. 17-19)

Submit Self-Study to External Reviewers	1 month prior	Electronic (pdf) copies are preferred. The department is responsible for distributing the Self-Study report to external reviewers, dean of college, faculty, staff, and students (as appropriate) and AVPAA.
Prepare & Submit Program Response to the External Review Team	14 days after receipt	Program should receive final report within 21 days after site visit and has 14 days to respond. See page 5 for specifics on writing the program response.
Attend Post Review Meeting	Approx. 60 days after review	The Post Review meeting is schedule by the AVPAA. Department Chair will lead meeting discussion. (p. 5)
Status Reports	1 year after & 4 years after	See page 5.

DATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. James M. Palmer
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

THROUGH: Dr. Darin Hoskisson
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

THROUGH: [Academic Dean Name]
[College/School Name]

FROM: [Department Chair Name]
[Department Name]

SUBJECT: [Name of Program] Academic Program Review: Reviewer
Nominations for Approval Consideration

In preparation for the [Name of Program], please see the attached list of nominations for outside reviewers. *Nomination form will be provided by the AVPAA.* These are listed in priority order and include area of expertise, name, title, institution and contact information.

For Chair of the review team, [Name of Reviewer] is the first choice or [Name of Reviewer]. Either is acceptable as Chair. *Additional optional content that describes who/how the list was compiled and any related details deemed by the department or program that is relevant.*

If there are any non-standard requests on the number of reviewers, budget considerations or other items, please reference here (these would be related to size or complexity of program) reflect any college or department support for additional items, etc. (See p. 5 of the Guidelines).

Thank you for your consideration of these nominations.

cc: Nomination Form

IV. Resources: Template for Invitation Letter to External Review Team

[Name of Department]

[Name of College]

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Kingsville, TX 78363

Dear [Insert Review Team Member Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the external review team evaluating the academic program(s) for the [Program] at Texas A&M University-Kingsville. Each degree program at Texas A&M University-Kingsville undergoes a comprehensive review of their programs approximately every ten years. This letter confirms the time frame and some of the arrangements for the review. In addition, a charge letter and a team roster are enclosed. The charge letter elaborates on our expectations for the review.

The review process will begin on [insert day] evening, [insert date] and will conclude on [insert day] afternoon, [insert date]. As an external reviewer, you will receive a \$1000.00 professional service fee. In addition, Texas A&M University-Kingsville will cover the costs of your airfare, lodging, and meals related to the review. No federal funds will be expended on the review or your fee. We have reserved a room for you near campus for your visit.

Dr. [Insert Name of Department Chair], chair of the department, will plan the logistics of the review, the self-study and the itinerary, and will communicate with you directly. All review materials, as well as contact information and our internal guidelines, will be provided to you by our Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

I am grateful to you and the other members of the review committee for your willingness to help with this important review. Please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Darin Hoskisson, our Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at (361) 593-2170 or the Department Chair, [insert name] at [email] or [phone], if you have any questions or need further information. I look forward to meeting you.

Sincerely,

James M. Palmer
Provost & Senior Vice President

Enclosures

cc: [Dean]
[Department Chair]
Dr. Darin Hoskisson

IV. Resources: Template for Charge to External Review Team

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Academic Program Review
Charge to External Review Team
[Department Name]
[Program Name, Degree]

The Academic Program Review process at Texas A&M University-Kingsville provides the occasion for academic units to plan strategically, assess the quality and efficacy of their programs, and determine the best courses of action for ongoing improvement. The program review is at the heart of our institutional commitment to excellence, and we sincerely thank you for assisting us. This letter provides you with the charge to the external review team and a brief overview of the program.

External Review Team Charge

Please examine the program and make recommendations that will help in planning improvements. Your resources are a self-study report prepared by the program, copies of materials from the program's last review, if applicable, information you gain through personal interactions while visiting Texas A&M University-Kingsville, copies of strategic plans and goal-setting documents at the department, college, and/or university level, and any additional information requested by you or by the program. Within the broad charge of recommending ways the program can continue to improve are some specific questions that we would like you to address:

- Based on the data / information provided in the self-study report or gathered by the external review team, what are the program's overall strengths and weaknesses?
- How well do the program's strategic goals align with those of its college and with those of Texas A&M University-Kingsville?
- How would you compare this program with its peers?
- What improvements (including student learning and faculty development) has the program made since the previous program review (if applicable)?
- With only current resources or a modest infusion of new ones, what specific recommendations could improve the program's performance, marginally or significantly?

Overview of the Program

[Provide an overview of the program, along with a chart (using OIR data) indicating the number of graduates per degree program for the previous five years.]

We look forward to meeting with you during your time on campus. If you have any questions or

require additional information prior to your visit, please contact [Department Chair email and phone].

Sincerely,

James M. Palmer
Provost & Senior Vice President

IV. Resources: Sample Itinerary

– Travel & Welcome

Time	Activity
2:00-5:00 pm	Review Team arrives in Kingsville. Lodging is arranged by the AVPAA.
6:00-8:00 pm	Welcome dinner hosted by Department Chair at local restaurant. Orientation/background will be provided at this time. Those in attendance include Department Chair and/or other relevant people. The Provost office will reimburse up to \$250.

– Day 1

Time	Activity
7:30-8:30 am	Entry Meeting with Provost's Administrative Team (at the hotel) Continental breakfast provided by the hotel (Scheduled by AVPAA)
9:00-10:00 am	Meet with the Dean
10:00-11:30	Meet with Department Chair and/or Program Coordinator
11:30-1:30	Lunch*
1:30-3:30 pm	Tour departmental facilities
3:30-4:30 pm	Meet with faculty in sub-discipline areas
5:00 pm	Return to hotel / Dinner* / Work session for review team

* **LUNCH:** Options include (1) student brown bag or pizza; or (2) reviewers dine with current department chairs within the college (excluding the Department Chair of the review).

DINNER: Options include (1) food catered to the hotel workroom; or (2) reviewers dine with program representatives (often the reviewers desire to eat alone after the faculty reception to discuss review issues and work on draft for final report).

– Day 2

Time	Activity
7:30-8:30 am	Reviewers eat breakfast at the hotel; Continental breakfast provided by the hotel
9:00-10:30 am	Meet with faculty committees
10:30-11:30 am	Meet with students

11:30 am-1:00 pm	Lunch*
1:00-2:00 pm	Meet with department chairs within the same college
2:00-3:00 pm	
3:00-5:00 pm	Open time
5:00-6:00 pm	Dinner*
6:00-9:00 pm	Reviewers' work session - prep for draft report / faculty debrief

* **LUNCH:** Options include (1) department section heads; (2) student brown bag or pizza; (3) reviewers dine with current department chairs within the college (excluding the Department Chair of the review); or (4) Department Chair and select faculty.

DINNER: Should be catered to the reviewers' hotel workroom so they may eat and prepare the draft final report

– Day 3

Time	Activity
7:30 -9:30 am	Exit Meeting with AVPAA + <i>Dean</i> (or designee) at the hotel; Continental breakfast provided by the hotel. (Scheduled by AVPAA, however, department will confirm Dean's attendance)
9:00-10:00 am	Reviewers debrief Department Chair at the hotel
10:00-11:00 am	Reviewers make final changes to draft report, as necessary
11:00 am-12:00 pm	Reviewers brief faculty, staff, and students on final report
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch with Department Chair before departure
1:00-3:00 pm	Reviewers depart Kingsville

IV. Resources: Transportation/Meals/Lodging

Transportation

The *department* is responsible for arranging all transportation for the external review team. Transportation should be arranged at least two months prior to the review. To maintain budget limits, fare costs should be no more than \$600 per traveler on average. Arrival time should be scheduled for reviewers to attend a welcome dinner. Departments should book flights using standard administrative business practice. Provide a copy of the invoice and itinerary to the AVPAA as soon as a ticket is booked. *Reviewers are at liberty to schedule their own flights (per department preference) as long they travel economy class and do not exceed \$600. Reimbursement will be provided after receipt of the external review team's final report.* Arrangement of one rental car for the review team would be appropriate. The department will be reimbursed for the cost of a rental car (if needed). The

department may be responsible for escorting the external review team to and from Corpus Christi Airport.

Meals

The *department/program* is responsible for arranging lunches, dinners, and the reception for the external review team. The Provost office will reimburse the department up to \$200 (total) for lunches and dinners and up to \$250 for the Welcome Dinner. Meals should be arranged approximately one month prior to the visit. Meals should not be extravagant and should be fiscally responsible. (Refer to the Expense Summary Chart). See "Sample Itinerary" for more specifics regarding meal arrangements and note the different options to be utilized for lunches.

Lodging

Lodging is arranged by the AVPAA. Lodging will be in close proximity to campus.

IV. Resources: Reimbursement Protocol

Upon completion of the review, please provide the AVPAA with a detailed spreadsheet of expenses attaching all receipts. Reimbursement will not be given without proper receipts. The Office of the Provost will not cover tax. Ideally, the department under review should initially pay for all expenses and the Office of the Provost will reimburse the department after the review is completed. Accounts beginning with 2 are preferred for reimbursement transfer. For any questions, please contact the AVPAA.

Reimbursable Expenses

Item	Estimated Expense	Notes
Self-Study Report	Under \$100	Copying, binding, mailing costs; it is recommended this document be shared electronically; reimbursement for up to 2-3 hard copies with receipt.
Airfare	Average of \$600/flight per reviewer	Arranged by department; airfare should be non-refundable coach fare. Department is responsible for non-approved expenses in excess of this amount.
Rental Car	State rates and guidelines applied	Expenses for one rental car for the use of the team allowed.
Welcome Dinner	Up to \$250	Welcome dinner with review team, Department Chair and department representatives/committee (size of delegation to join review team is at Department Chair's discretion; expenses reimbursed for average of 6-8 people).
Meals during review	Up to \$200 (total)	Lunches and dinners

Expenses Paid/Reimbursed to External Review Team

Item	Estimated Expense	Notes
Professional Fee	\$1000 per person	To be allocated once the external review team's final report is sent to the Provost
In-transit expenses		Parking, mileage, rental car (if needed) from CRP to Kingsville, and meals (no alcohol)

All lodging expenses are paid directly by the Provost.

V. TAMUK Academic Program Review Ten-Year Cycle – (2020-2030)

No more than 20% of an institution's total programs can be reviewed in one academic year.

Academic Year **Fall 2019 – Summer 2020**

Chemistry **Masters**

Criminology **Bachelors**

Industrial Engineering **Masters**

Industrial Engineering **Bachelors****

Industrial Management **Masters**

Industrial Management and Applied Engineering Technology **Bachelors****

Natural Gas Engineering **Masters**

Natural Gas Engineering **Bachelors****

Academic Year **Fall 2020 – Summer 2021**

Agriculture Science **Masters**

Communication Sciences and Disorders **Masters****

Communication Sciences and Disorders **Bachelors**

Adult Education **Masters**

Academic Year **Fall 2021 - Summer 2022**

Animal Science **Bachelors**

Applied Arts and Sciences **Bachelors**

Sociology **Masters**

Spanish **Bachelors**

Early Childhood **Masters**

Education **Bachelors**

Kinesiology **Masters**

Kinesiology **Bachelors**

Academic Year **Fall 2022 - Summer 2023**

Plant and Soil Science **Masters**

Art **Bachelors**

Biomedical Sciences **Bachelors**

Communication **Bachelors**

Criminal Justice **Bachelors**

Psychology **Masters**

Statistical Analytics, Computing, and Modeling **Masters**

Sustainable Energy Systems Engineering **Doctoral** (Discontinued)

Academic Year **Fall 2023 - Summer 2024**

Music **Masters****

Music **Bachelors****

Academic Year **Fall 2024 - Summer 2025**

Wildlife and Rangeland Sciences **Doctoral**

Range and Wildlife Management **Masters**

Range and Wildlife Management **Bachelors****

Counseling Psychology **Masters**

Psychology **Bachelors**

Criminology **Masters**

Education **Masters**

Educational Leadership **Doctoral**

Educational Administration **Masters**

Special Education **Masters**

Computer Science **Masters**

Computer Science **Bachelors****

Academic Year **Fall 2025 - Summer 2026**

Agribusiness **Bachelors**

Animal Science **Masters**

Animal-Wildlife Veterinary Technology **Bachelors****

Chemistry **Bachelors**

Human Nutrition – Dietetic Internship **Masters****

Human Nutrition **Bachelors****

Social Work **Masters****

Social Work **Bachelors****

Sociology **Bachelors**

Bilingual Education **Doctoral**

Bilingual Education **Masters**

Instructional Technology **Masters**

Reading Specialization **Masters**

Academic Year **Fall 2026 - Summer 2027**

Agriculture Science **Bachelors**

Physics **Bachelors**

Taxation **Masters****

Clinical Mental Health Counseling **Masters****

Counseling and Guidance **Masters**

Computer Engineering **Bachelors****

Electrical Engineering **Masters**

Electrical Engineering **Bachelors****

Engineering **Doctoral**

Mechanical Engineering **Masters**

Mechanical Engineering **Bachelors****

Mechatronics Engineering **Masters**

Academic Year **Fall 2027 - Summer 2028**

Environmental Systems Management **Masters**

Cultural Studies **Masters**

General Studies **Bachelors**

Geology **Bachelors**

Mathematics **Bachelors**

Petrophysics **Masters**

Accounting **Bachelors****

Business Administration **Masters****

Finance **Bachelors****

General Business **Bachelors****

Information Systems **Bachelors**** (Phased out in 2026)

Management **Bachelors****

Marketing **Bachelors****

Architectural Engineering **Bachelors****

Civil Engineering **Masters**

Civil Engineering **Bachelors****

Academic Year **Fall 2028 - Summer 2029**

Ranch Management **Masters**

Biology **Masters**

Biology **Bachelors**

English **Bachelors**

History **Bachelors**

Political Science **Bachelors**

Chemical Engineering **Masters**

Chemical Engineering **Bachelors****

Environmental Engineering **Doctoral**

Environmental Engineering **Masters**

Environmental Engineering **Bachelors****

**** Accreditation Report will be used, no Program Review required**