Guide to Academic Program Review

Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

University of Houston Clear Lake

Revised December 2024

GUIDE TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Introduction

The University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) has committed itself to an ongoing, cyclical, comprehensive academic program review (APR) process of its degree programs at all levels: bachelor, master, and doctoral.

Those directly involved in each individual review include the program faculty, the program chair, the program report committee, the college faculty and administration, the college curriculum committee, and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Each has a clearly specified role in the process.

The Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost has responsibility for general oversight of program review; the Office of Planning and Assessment is the APR coordinator on behalf of the Provost's Office.

Purpose of Program Review

Program review is an integral part of the university's overall planning process and occurs on a ten-year cycle as set by the university and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). Its purposes are the following:

- To improve program quality in the context of university and college missions; to implement criteria for program approval by the state, national accreditation standards, and guidelines put forth by academic organizations; and to address institutional resource needs and demands.

- To help a program examine itself in its entirety (its focus, faculty, curriculum, students, resources and facilities, and learning outcomes) within a framework that includes its past development and its plans for achieving the university's goal of continuously improving the quality of all academic programs in the pursuit of excellence.

- To provide the program with an impartial study of and response to the work presented in the Program Report by informed colleagues outside the program (graduate level only).

Program Review Process

UHCL has aligned both its bachelor and master degree program review process with the regulations established in 2011 and revised in 2019 by THECB for graduate programs with one exception: undergraduate programs do not require an external review. All other THECB guidelines apply. ***UHCL programs must submit separate program reviews for each level of their programs. Any exception needs to be approved by the THECB.***

Of particular note from the THECB are the following:

- During any given year of a cycle, an institution may review no more than 20 percent of its graduate programs.

- New graduate programs must be reviewed no later than the seventh year after the start date of the program.

- During the ten-year cycle, each program is reviewed using the criteria listed in Rule 5.52 (see Appendix 1). The process must include a programmatic self-study and a review by external consultants with discipline expertise who are employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas. ***Doctoral programs shall be reviewed by at least two external consultants and master's programs by at least one***.

- **Graduate programs** that are accredited by an external body may use the results of their accreditation review to satisfy the review requirements under Rule 5.52. No additional external review is necessary. ***Undergraduate accreditation may NOT be applied to a graduate program.***

Roles and Responsibilities

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
As the university's chief academic officer, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost acts on behalf of the institution in the following ways:

- The Office of Planning and Assessment initiates the program review process sending a letter to the Dean requesting review of programs according to the University's master review schedule and identifying issues of current, general university concern.

- The Provost and Vice Provost receive the completed Program Review Report and related documents from the Office of Planning and Assessment.

- The Provost conducts an Exit Interview with the Dean, the Vice Provost, and the program faculty, together, to discuss the findings of the Program Review Report and Executive Summary.

- The Office of Planning and Assessment sends a written summary of the outcomes of the Exit Interview to the Dean, including any identified programmatic changes to be made.

Dean
The Dean acts on behalf of the college in the following ways:

- Appoints the Program Report Committee, names the chair, and notifies the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the APR Coordinator in Planning and Assessment.

- Instructs the Program Report Committee to address specific concerns and issues as it carries out its responsibilities.

- Ensures that the Program Report Committee produces the Program Report in a timely fashion.

- Ensures that the college's Curriculum Committee has studied and approved the Program Report.
- Reviews and attests to the accuracy and completeness of the Program Report.
- Provides the institutional response to the external review.
- Sends electronic copies of the Program Report and all relevant materials to the APR Coordinator in the Office of Planning and Assessment.
- Attends the Exit Interview with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Vice Provost, and the program faculty, together, to discuss the findings of the Program Report and Executive Summary to determine appropriate follow-up as needed.
- Receives the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's written summary of the outcomes of the Exit Interview.
- Works with the program faculty, along with other college bodies essential to the process, to address any problems and recommendations ensuing from the review.

Program Report Committee

The college Program Report Committee produces the Program Review Report. The Dean appoints the chair and members of the committee that produce the Report. In most cases, the committee will consist of the program faculty, but people external to the program may also serve.

The duties of the chair are the following:

- Contacts the Office of Institutional Research to review and discuss the program data as needed.
- Convenes all meetings.
- Designates work assignments to members.
- Maintains the production schedule within the given time period.
- Reports interim progress to the Dean.
- Contacts the Neumann Library (Associate Director for Public Services) for a supporting resource review, including books, journal holdings, Texas and U. S. government documents, specialized microform collections, and electronic databases.
- Oversees the production of the final report.
- Submits the report to the college Curriculum Committee.
- Responds to the recommendations of the curriculum committee.
- Oversees the production of the response to the External Review.

Committee members are responsible for performing their work assignments in a timely manner, reviewing and revising the compiled document and representing the program at the Exit Interview with the Senior

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Vice Provost, the Dean, and the APR Coordinator of Planning and Assessment.

College Curriculum Committee
The college Curriculum Committee acts on behalf of the faculty of the college in ensuring that the Program Report meets college standards and expectations and is ready for presentation to the Dean. The signature of the chair attests to the Curriculum Committee's official approval of the Program Report.

Time Frame

Schedule
All programs will undergo review on the established ten-year cycle. Each program's review schedule may be found in the approved Program Review Schedule maintained by the Vice Provost. When feasible, the program reviews may coincide with state approval and/or national accreditation review.

Length of Process
The program review process should be completed in 17 months. It commences with the Office of Planning and Assessment's notification to the Deans, no later than January 15 of the calendar year before the review is to conclude and ends with the formal college/program Exit Interview.

Timeline Overview
The timeline over the 17-month period provides open periods of time during which various activities may be completed; however, programs and colleges should maintain the schedule and provide information or materials by the dates specified. The Dean or a designee should inform the APR Coordinator in the Office of Planning and Assessment of delays or significant deviation from the timeline.

Program Review Timeline

January 1-15	On behalf of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the APR Coordinator in the Office of Planning and Assessment sends emails with the most current Program Review Template and Guide to Academic Program Review Manual to Deans identifying programs due for review.
March 15-30	Deans appoint the Program Report Committees, name the chairs, and notify the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the APR Coordinator of those appointments.
April-October	Program Report Committee meets, assigns responsibilities, and writes draft.
August 31	Colleges request stipends for external reviewers through the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's Office by August 31.
November-January	The Program Report Committee presents a draft to the college's Curriculum Committee and makes changes, if any, as directed. The Program Review Committee presents an approved report to the Dean.
February	The Dean or designee submits the undergraduate internal Program Report to the APR Coordinator for review and forwarding to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and Vice Provost. Dean or designee sends graduate program review to external reviewer(s).

March-May	Upon receiving the external review, the Dean or designee writes a response to comments by the external reviewer and submits both the external review and the response to the APR Coordinator.
May-June	The Provost's Office sets up Exit Interviews with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Vice Provost, Dean, Program Report Committee/Faculty, and the APR Coordinator.
June-July	The APR Coordinator sends the Provost's summary of the Exit Interview to the Dean.
August 31	The APR Coordinator must submit all graduate program reviews to the THECB by this date.

Report Content for Program Reviews

The following structure will guide you in completing the program review report for bachelor degree, master degree, and doctoral degree programs.

Front Matter
The Program Report begins with a cover sheet followed by a table of contents, and an executive summary.

A. Cover Sheet
The cover sheet contains the names of the program, the program chair, and the college, as well as the date on which the program began. It must also include the signatures of the Program Review Committee chair, the College Curriculum Committee chair, and the Dean, along with the dates those signatures were affixed. Finally, it must contain spaces for the signatures of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Vice Provost, and for the dates when they sign the document.

B. Table of Contents
For easy reference, please provide a table of contents to at least the second level of headings.

C**. Executive Summary**
The executive summary should provide a condensed version of the content in your report. Include major findings from each section of the body and identify ***key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats revealed in the program review***. See Appendix 2.

Main Content
Per the THECB Best Practices, the narrative should address the items below. The narrative should include a paragraph or two for each of the main content sections, summarizing the most important information. THECB identifies mandated data and the way it maps to the topics below; ***programs should complete the tables provided in the template to supplement the content of the narrative***.

A. Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan
1. Vision, Mission, and Goals
2. Strategic Plan

B. Program Curriculum

1. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
2. Curriculum development, coordination, and delivery
3. Student Learning Outcome Assessment
4. Program Curriculum compared to peer programs

C. Faculty Productivity

1. Qualifications
2. Publications
3. External grants
4. Teaching Load
5. Faculty/Student Ratio
6. Achievements
7. Profile
8. Community/Public Service
9. Teaching Evaluations
10. Development

D. Students and Graduates

1. Demographics
2. Time to Degree
3. Publications/Awards
4. Retention Rates
5. Graduation Rates
6. Enrollment (# of Students, SCHs)
7. License Rates
8. Graduate Placement
9. Degrees Conferred Annually
10. Admissions
11. Student Support Services
12. Tracking Program Graduates

E. Facilities/Resources

1. Facilities and Equipment
2. Finances and Resources
3. Program Administration
4. Staff Resources
5. Developmental Resources

Conclusion

The conclusion serves as the capstone of the program's review of itself. Each item below must be addressed.

A. How has the program changed since the last program review and how have these changes affected the quality of the program as well as the students and faculty in the program?
B. How is the information collected in the annual plan used in planning and assessing the program?
C. Where should the program go in the next five years? Why? How? As dependent on what resources?

Mandatory Data Appendix

One document is required for each appendix category in the list below. ***The THECB has identified the list below as mandated data. Programs should include these in the appendix in whole.*** The data collection should be based on the last five completed academic years. ***Programs should incorporate key data points in the content of the report.*** Appendix 3 has location of mandated data sources.

Mandatory Data by THECB

(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
(S) Program administration

Additional appendices may be used as needed to accurately portray the results of the program review.

Additional Documents for the Graduate Level Program Review Only

---

External Review

As stipulated by Rule 5.52, graduate programs must provide an external review at the time of the submission of the program review report. External reviewers must have discipline expertise, be employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas, and confirm they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

Based on the program review report provided by the program, external reviewers should provide an analysis ranging from 2-5 pages in length which addresses the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement in the program. Along with your review request letter, you may provide the reviewer with the External Reviewer Program Review Checklist for Master's Programs. (See Appendix 4.) **Stipends for external reviewers are available through the Provost's Office and must be requested by August 31.**

Graduate programs using accreditation documents should submit the following:

- Accreditation document from the accrediting body
  - May ***NOT*** use undergraduate accreditation documents for a graduate program
- Summary of accreditation findings

- Institutional response
    - Indicate whether or not the program accreditation was achieved/renewed/continued

Response to External Review
The Dean or Associate Dean is to provide the college's response to the external evaluation, noting plans to address the report's findings. THECB has noted in past program reviews that program coordinators and department chairs do not always have the authority to designate financial support; thus, university or college administration should author the response.

Please note THECB comments on previous program reviews.

> Include comments on each of the significant recommendations of the consultant, even if the Department has not reached a decision whether to proceed with the recommendation. These comments could include 1) previous discussions about the issue, 2) preliminary thoughts regarding agreement or disagreement with the recommendation, 3) possible ways to address the issue, 4) how peer institutions address the issue, and 5) the timeline for implementing the recommendation, if appropriate. For future institutional responses to the external reports of graduate programs, please adhere to these guidelines.

Report Checklist and Submission

Program Review Checklist
To ensure you are submitting a complete report, please use the following checklist.

> Cover sheet is complete and signed appropriately.
>
> Table of contents is clear and adequate.
>
> Executive Summary includes major findings from each section of the report.
>
> Content of report covers the five major areas of the self-study.
>
> All five major areas of the self-study are complete.
>
> Conclusion discusses the path the program has taken since the last program review and provides a path forward for excellence.
>
> Appendix A includes the THECB Mandatory Data. Some mandatory data may be combined (A vita, for example, could be used for faculty qualifications and publications; an IR data report may have several data points and can be used in multiple sections.)
>
> All appendix items are clearly marked or labeled.

Report Submission
The Dean or Associate Dean submits completed program review documents to the APR Coordinator in the Office of Planning and Assessment.

For undergraduate reports, please submit one electronic file of the program review.

- File 1: Program Review Self-Study Report

For graduate reports, please submit three files.

- File 1: Program Review Self Study Report
- File 2: External Review
- File 3: Response to External Review

These files will be submitted by the APR Coordinator in the Office of Planning and Assessment to the THECB by August 31st.

For questions or help, please contact:
Tammy Braswell APR Coordinator, Office of Planning and Assessment
braswell@uhcl.edu
on Teams
281-283-3021

Glossary of Terms

Curriculum
The aggregate courses of study in a program.

Exit Interview
Meeting of the Dean, Vice Provost, and the program faculty with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost to discuss findings of the Program Report and the Executive Summary, with special attention to concerns, problems, and recommendations.

Executive Summary
A summary of the program review report and program issues.

External Review
An analysis ranging from 2-5 pages in length addressing the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement in the program.

External Review Response
The college's response to the external evaluation, noting plans to address the report's findings; written by the Dean or the Associate Dean.

External Reviewer
A subject-matter expert who is part of a program nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline and who is employed by an institution outside of Texas to review the Program Review Report of a graduate program. Reviewers will be paid a stipend and will be provided with materials and products of the program review. They may be brought to campus for an on-site review or may be asked to conduct a remote desk review. External reviewers must affirm they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

Learning Outcome
Clear statements that describe/specify the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, abilities, values, and/or competencies that students are expected to acquire/demonstrate upon completion or participation in a program, activity, course, or project.

Master Program Review Schedule
The official roster of programs by year in which they undergo program review, developed and maintained by the Office of the Vice Provost.

Program
Any academic unit offering a collection of related degrees, support areas, concentrations, teaching fields, or certification offerings which a college wishes to group for a ten-year review.

Program Report Committee
The body appointed by the Dean to produce the Committee Program Report.

Program Review Self-study Report
The document that presents the results of the serious thinking the program has done about itself, its direction, and its future. It addresses the categories for review and follows the guidelines published in the Guide to UHCL Academic Program Review for its preparation.

Appendix 1. Texas Administrative Code 5.52

<<Prev Rule	Texas Administrative Code	Next Rule>>
TITLE 19	EDUCATION	
PART 1	TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD	
CHAPTER 5	RULES APPLYING TO PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND/OR SELECTED PUBLIC COLLEGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS	
SUBCHAPTER C	APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND REVIEW OF EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS	
RULE §5.52	Review of Existing Degree Programs	

(a) 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.

(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 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:

(A) The Characteristics of Texas Public 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 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.

(d) 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 Workforce.

(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 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.
(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; amended to be effective August 15, 2013, 38 TexReg 5063; amended to be effective May 29, 2018, 43 TexReg 3347

Appendix 2. How to Write an Executive Summary

An executive summary is a nontechnical condensation of a report addressed to a managerial or executive audience. It provides a basic understanding of the situation, problem, or opportunity that led to the report as well as major findings.

Purpose

The purpose of an executive summary is for the intended audience (administrators, reviewers, evaluators) to make funding, personnel, or policy decisions based on findings or recommendations and may be the only section read.

An executive summary consolidates the principal points of the report in one place. It is a comprehensive statement of the document's purpose, scope, method, results, conclusions, and recommendations of the report. It is organized according to the paper's sequence of chapters or sections.

Length

An executive summary tends to be limited to 1-2 pages in length.

Keep in mind the following questions as you draft an executive summary:

- What was the problem, circumstance, or opportunity that motivated the project? Focus on the specific evidence.
- What methods did you use to carry out the research? How were results obtained? Be brief.
- In the self-study report, what were the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations?

After writing the executive summary, give it to someone outside the project who can evaluate its clarity and readability.

Summarizing the Program Review Self-Study

Use your table of contents and data as your guide and write a paragraph or two for each of the major sections, summarizing the most important information. Per THECB Best Practices, identify "strengths of the program and areas of concern."

Additional Resources

Guidelines for Writing an Executive Summary: http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/executivesummary

Appendix 3. Data Sources for Program Review Report
Source and/or Report Path

A. Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan	
1. Vision, Mission and Goals	Program
2. Strategic Plan	Program
B. Program Curriculum	
1. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes	Program
2. Curriculum development, coordination and delivery	Program
3. Student Learning Outcome Assessment	Program or Microsoft Teams
4. Program Curriculum compared to peer programs	IR Website: Peer Institution Web Sites https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/state-federal-data
C. Faculty Productivity	
1. Qualifications	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) CV's or Faculty Roster
2. Publications	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Scholarship/Research
3. External grants	IR or Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Scholarship/Research
4. Teaching Load	Program Shared drive: OIE_College_Data: Faculty and Course Load (Program or Colleges to determine)
5. Faculty/Student Ratio	Program Shared drive: OIE_College_Data: Faculty and Course Load (Program or Colleges to determine)
6. Achievements	Digital Measures (Activity Insight): Annual Activity Report
7. Profile	IR Website: Faculty Profile by Course Subject https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/faculty-data
8. Community/Public Service	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Service Activities
9. Teaching Evaluations	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Scheduled Teaching
10. Development	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Annual Activity Report

D. Students and Graduates	
1. Demographics	IR Data Portal: Program Review Report: Student Enrollment Demographics https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
2. Time to Degree	IR Data Portal: https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
3. Publications/Awards	Digital Measures (Activity Insight) Report: Publications
4. Retention Rates	IR Data Portal: Program Review Report: Cohort Based Retention and Graduation Rates https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
5. Graduation Rates	IR Data Portal: Program Review Report: Cohort Based Retention and Graduation Rates https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
6. Enrollment (# of Students, SCHs)	IR Data Portal: Program Review Report: Student Enrollment Demographics https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
7. License Rates	Program
8. Graduate Placement	IR Website: Graduating Student Surveys; Alumni Surveys https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/survey-data
9. Degrees Conferred Annually	IR Data Portal: Program Review Report: Degrees Conferred https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-research/
10. Admissions	Enrollment Management Data: https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/emdata/
11. Student Support Services	Program
12. Tracking Program Graduates	Program
E. Facilities/Resources	
1. Facilities and Equipment	Program
2. Finances and Resources	Program
3. Program Administration	Program
4. Staff Resources	Program
5. Developmental Resources	Program

Appendix 4. External Reviewer Check List

University of Houston Clear Lake

External Reviewer

Program Review Checklist for Master's Programs

Instructions: As you review this program, please provide comments in each of the areas included in this checklist.

Faculty

Qualifications
Publications
External Grants
Teaching Load
Faculty/Student Ratio

Students

Demographics
Time-to-degree
Publications and awards
Retention rates
Graduation rates
Enrollment
Licensure rates (if applicable)
Placements after graduation

Program Attributes

Number of degrees conferred annually
Alignment of program to program and university goals
Curriculum in comparison to peer programs
Facilities and equipment
Finance and resources
Management