Policy Statement. The University of North Texas will periodically conduct a review of all of its degree programs. The objective of program review is to promote the quality of each UNT academic program through an assessment of its curriculum, operations, and resources, as well as its mission, strength, and challenges. The department, dean, and provost and vice president for academic affairs will use the review results to guide university planning, determine program directions, establish objectives, shape institutional goals, and promote institutional effectiveness. Units that are externally accredited will be reviewed periodically by the accreditation review process. Those units that are not externally accredited will be reviewed by the process described in this policy.

Application of Policy. All Faculty.

Definitions. None.

Procedures and Responsibilities.

1.0 Program Review Procedure and Criteria.

In Stage I, an academic unit will complete a review for each of its degree programs. All undergraduate and graduate programs in a department/unit will be reviewed at the same time.

Programs will normally be reviewed every seven years according to a regular schedule maintained by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. For programs, schools, or colleges with professional accreditation, the review schedule will be determined by the accreditation cycle of the appropriate professional organization.

Criteria for program reviews shall include quantitative and qualitative analyses. Examples of quantitative statistics include enrollment trends, credit hour production, student-teacher ratio, entrance examination scores, degrees awarded, and graduation rates. Qualitative evaluation should encompass instructional effectiveness, research, service, advising, students' knowledge and competencies, and assessment of student learning outcomes. Each program is required to maintain an up-to-date list of student learning outcomes with assessment procedures to determine if students are achieving those outcomes. Additionally, the reviews should include some assessment of input measures such as fiscal resources, facilities, equipment, space, faculty, and staff. Program reviews of a department should involve wide participation of the departmental
faculty and should require input from a variety of sources. Examples include alumni, students, other departments, employers of graduates, and external constituents. If the unit has been previously reviewed, progress since the last review should be emphasized.

The provost and vice president for academic affairs will designate the staff member(s) to assume administrative responsibility for coordinating the annual program reviews.

A program will be subject to a Stage II review if deficiencies identified in Stage I are determined by the provost and vice president for academic affairs to warrant a Stage II review.

2.0 Program Review Process.

The key element in the review process is the preparation of a department/unit Stage I self-study document covering all undergraduate and graduate programs in the unit. This will begin in September of the designated year, follow the format prescribed by the office of Academic Affairs, and be transmitted through the department chair and dean to the coordinator in Academic Affairs.

The provost and vice president for academic affairs' staff coordinator will select three UNT faculty members as the Stage I review team and designate one as chair. At least two of the three reviewers should be from another school/college with the third faculty member from a different department. If a doctoral program is included in an academic unit review, the review team members should be graduate faculty with at least one Category III member.

The department/unit and the appropriate dean will be asked to submit a combined list of five potential external reviewers, and the provost and vice president for academic affairs' staff coordinator will select one of these individuals to participate in the review. The provost and vice president for academic affairs will cover the honorarium and costs associated with the external reviewer.

3.0 The process for Stage I department/unit review is:

The review team, including the external reviewer, will read the Stage I self-study report and conduct a site visit of the program and report to the coordinator.

The department/unit will prepare a response to the review team's report, and the school/college dean will submit comments on the review report and the department response to the coordinator.

The meeting to assess the findings of the Stage I review will include the provost and vice president for academic affairs or vice provost and associate vice president for academic affairs, school/college dean, and department/unit chair. This meeting will focus on
recommendations made by reviewers and how they will be used by the unit to improve their academic programs. Any changes made that are based on the program review results should be recorded by the department, and records should be kept until the next program review. After this meeting, the provost and vice president for academic affairs will determine whether a Stage II review is warranted for any program within the unit and notify the dean and the unit administrator.

If a Stage II review is required, the process is:

a. A Stage II program review should be completed within three years of the Stage I review, to allow the unit adequate time to address the concerns raised by the Stage I review.

b. A Stage II review follows the same general procedures as a Stage I review and is conducted in the same time frame as the Stage I reviews for that year.

c. The internal review team for a Stage II review may be the same as that from the unit’s Stage I review or may be reconstituted.

d. In Stage II, the external reviewer may be the same as in the unit’s Stage I review, or another external reviewer may be selected using the same process.

4.0 Mid-Term Follow-Up.

In the third year following completion of a Program Review, a unit will be asked to report on its progress in addressing the issues identified in the Program Review.

**Responsible Party:** VP Academic Affairs

References and Cross-references. None.

Approved: 10/01/1993
Effective:
Revised: 7/94; 8/98; 2/99; 5/01; 7/02; 7/03; 4/11*
*Reviewed with no change, formatted