

Guide to Academic Program Review
2020-2021

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Revised April 2020

University of Houston  Clear Lake

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.....	1
Introduction	1
Definition of a Program	1
Purpose of Program Review	1
Program Review Process	2
Roles and Responsibilities	2
Provost.....	2
Dean.....	3
Program Report Committee	3
College Curriculum Committee	4
Time Frame	4
Schedule	4
Length of Process	4
Time Line Overview	4
Program Review Time Line	5
Report Content for Program Reviews	5
Front Matter	5
A. Cover Sheet	5
B. Table of Contents	6
C. List of Tables.....	6
D. Executive Summary.....	6
Main Content.....	6
A. Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan.....	6
B. Program Curriculum	6
C. Faculty Productivity.....	6
D. Students and Graduates.....	6
E. Facilities/Resources.....	7
Conclusion	7
Mandatory Data Appendix	7
Additional Documents for the Graduate Level Program Review Only	8
External Review	8
Response to External Review	8
Report Format and Submission	8
Format Recommendations.....	8
Report Submission.....	9
Glossary of Terms.....	10
Appendix 1. Texas Administrative Code 5.52.....	11
Appendix 2: Sample Cover Sheet	14
Appendix 3. How to Write an Executive Summary.....	15
Appendix 4. Data Sources for Program Review Report	16
Appendix 5. External Reviewer Check List	18

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 and Provost. Each has a clearly specified role in the process.

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost has responsibility for general oversight of program review; the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) is the APR coordinator on behalf of the Provost's Office.

Definition of a Program

Generally, a *program* is any academic unit offering a collection of related degrees, support areas, concentrations, teaching fields, or certification offerings which a college wishes to group for the review.

A *program* is an academic entity. *Curriculum* is the aggregate courses of study in a program. Thus, for purposes of program review, *program* and *curriculum* are NOT synonymous terms. A program offers at least one curriculum. It also has initial responsibility for the quality of that curriculum, the faculty who offer the curriculum, the students in the curriculum, the resources, and facilities supporting the curriculum, and the focus of the program (unit) in all dimensions of its operation.

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.
- 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.

Roles and Responsibilities

Provost

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

- Initiates the program review process by 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.
- Receives the completed Program Review Report and related documents from the Office of the Dean.
- Conducts an Exit Interview with the Dean, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA), and the program faculty, together, to discuss the findings of the Program Review Report and Executive Summary.
- 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:

- Responds to the Senior Vice President and Provost's request for review of programs according to the university's master review schedule.
- Appoints the Program Report Committee, names the chair, and notifies the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Executive Director of 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 Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
- Attends the Exit Interview with the Provost, the AVPAA, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, 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 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 persons external to the program may also serve.

The duties of the chair are the following:

- Contacts the Office of Institutional Effectiveness 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 and Provost, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, and the Dean.

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 Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. 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 Senior Vice President and Provost's notification to the Deans, no later than March 15 of the calendar year before the review is to conclude, and ends with the formal college/program Exit Interview.

Time Line Overview

The time line 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 Executive Director of OIE of delays or significant deviation from the time line.

Program Review Time Line

March 1-15	On behalf of the Provost, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment sends letters 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 and Provost and the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment of those appointments.
April-October	Program Report Committee meets, assigns responsibilities, and writes draft.
August 31	Colleges request stipends for external reviewers through the Provost's Office by August 31.
November-January	The Program Report Committee presents draft to college's Curriculum Committee and makes changes, if any, as directed. The Program Review Committee presents approved report to the Dean.
February	The Dean or designee submits the undergraduate internal Program Report to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for review and forwarding to the Provost. Dean or designee sends graduate program review to external reviewer(s).
March-May	Upon receiving the external review, the Dean or designee writes response to comments by external reviewer and submits both the external review and the response to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
May-June	The Provost's Office sets up Exit Interviews with the Provost, AVPAA, Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, Dean, and Program Report Committee/Faculty.
June-July	The Provost's Office sends the Provost's summary of the Exit Interview to the Dean.
August 31	OIE 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 and master degree programs.

Front Matter

The Program Report begins with a cover sheet followed by a table of contents, list of tables, 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 Report 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 Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Senior Vice President and Provost and for the dates when they sign the document. See sample cover sheet in Appendix 2.

B. Table of Contents

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

C. List of Tables

If you include four or more tables or charts in your report, please provide a list of tables.

D. Executive Summary

The executive summary should be a 1-2 page document that provides 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 3.

For graduate and doctoral program reviews, the Executive Summary will be submitted to the THECB in lieu of the entire self-study. Please ensure the Executive Summary covers the key findings of the self-study.

Main Content

Per the THECB Best Practices, the narrative should address the items below. This section of the report should not exceed more than 50 pages. Appendix 4 identifies mandated data required by the THECB and the way it maps to the topics below; programs should use tables and charts from these mandated data 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. Most program report committees will probably choose to address the questions in order, but some may find a different order will suit the needs of their report.

- 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 appendix item is required to support the report. 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 academic years. Programs should incorporate key data points in the Content of the Paper. See Appendix 4 for a mapping of mandated data to report content as well as 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 the External Reviewer Program Review Checklist for Master's Programs. (See Appendix 5.) Stipends for external reviewers are available through the Provost's Office and must be requested by August 31.

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. The THECB has noted in the 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 authorize the response.

Please note also the 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 Format and Submission

Format Recommendations

- Use a readable font, such as Times-Roman 12 pt.
- Use minimal graphs and tables within the body of the paper. Since you will include all mandatory data in Appendix A, your visuals within the report should supplement the narrative.

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.
- List of tables is clear and adequate.
- Executive Summary is 1-3 pages in length and includes major findings from each section of the report.
- Content of report covers five major areas of self-study.
- All five major areas of 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 OIE data report will have several data points.)
- All appendix items are clearly marked or labeled.

Report Submission

Please submit electronic files to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

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

- File 1: Program Review Report

For graduate reports, please submit four files.

- File 1: Executive Summary
- File 2: External Review
- File 3: Response to External Review
- File 4: Program Review Report

Only the first three files will be submitted to the THECB.

For questions or help, please contact:

Pat Cuchens, Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
cuchens@uhcl.edu or 281-283-3065

Karen Elliott, Assessment Coordinator I, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
elliott@uhcl.edu or 281-283-3053

Glossary of Terms

Curriculum

The aggregate courses of study in a program.

Exit Interview

Meeting of the Dean, the AVPAA, and the program faculty with the Provost to discuss findings of the Program Report and the Executive Summary, with special attention to concerns, problems, and recommendations.

Executive Summary

A 2-3 page written summary submitted to the Provost by the Dean or Program Report Committee summarizing the report and program issues.

External Review

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

External Review, Response to

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 Outcomes

Knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors to be exhibited by students after Outcomes program completion.

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 Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

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

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 and format published in the Guide to Program Review for its preparation.

Program Report Committee

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

8/10/2016

Texas Administrative Code

[<<Prev Rule](#)

[Next Rule>>](#)

Texas Administrative Code

[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 seven years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(8) Institutions shall review 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 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs;

(B) Student retention rates;

(C) Student enrollment;

[https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=98p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_floc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&S=19&pt=1&ch=5&ri=52](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=98p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_floc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&S=19&pt=1&ch=5&ri=52)

1/3

- (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 Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9) Criteria for the review of master's programs must include, but are not limited to:

- (A) Faculty qualifications;
- (B) Faculty publications;
- (C) Faculty external grants;
- (D) Faculty teaching load;

- (E) Faculty/student ratio;
- (F) Student demographics;
- (G) Student time-to-degree;
- (H) Student publication and awards;
- (I) Student retention rates;
- (J) Student graduation rates;
- (K) Student enrollment;
- (L) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);
- (M) Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training);
- (N) Number of degrees conferred annually;
- (O) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;
- (P) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;
- (Q) Program facilities and equipment;
- (R) Program finance and resources; and
- (S) Program administration.

(10) Institutions shall submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s) and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewer(s) have submitted their findings to the institution.

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

(e) The Coordinating Board shall review all reports submitted for master's and doctoral programs and shall conduct analysis as necessary to ensure high quality. Institutions may be required to take additional actions to improve their programs as a result of Coordinating Board review.

Source Note: The provisions of this §5.52 adopted to be effective August 26, 2009, 34 TexReg 5678; amended to be effective November 29, 2010, 35 TexReg 10496; amended to be effective May 24, 2011, 36 TexReg 3183; amended to be effective August 15, 2013, 38 TexReg 5063

[Next Page](#)

[Previous Page](#)

[List of Titles](#)

[Back to List](#)

[HOME](#) | [TEXAS REGISTER](#) | [TEXAS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE](#) | [OPEN MEETINGS](#)

Appendix 2: Sample Cover Sheet

UHCL Program Review

Name of Program	
Beginning Date of Program	
Name of Program Chair	
Name of College	
Name of Dean	

Signatures

Program Review Chair	Date
College Curriculum Committee Chair	Date
Dean	Date

Received by

Associate VP of Academic Affairs	Date
Senior VP of Academic Affairs and Provost	Date

Appendix 3. 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 principal points of report in one place. It is a comprehensive statement of document's purpose, scope, method, results, conclusions & recommendations of report. It may occasionally include tables, visuals or references/footnotes. It is organized according to paper's sequence of chapters or sections.

Length

An executive summary tends to be limited to 2-3 pages or 10% of the report's 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 as your guide and write a paragraph or two for each of the major sections, summarizing the most important information. (In some cases, you can use the first paragraph of that section if it clearly introduces the section and provides the main ideas.) Per THECB Best Practices, identify "strengths of the program and areas of concern."

Additional Resources

Guidelines for Writing an Executive Summary: <https://awc.ashford.edu/tocw-guidelines-for-writing-executive-summary.html>

Organizing Your Social Sciences Research Paper: Executive Summary:
<http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/executivesummary>

Appendix 4. 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	AMS (Taskstream) https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/taskstream/
4. Program Curriculum compared to peer programs	OIE Website: Peer Institution Web Sites http://prtl.uhcl.edu/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/state-federal-data
C. Faculty Productivity	
1. Qualifications	Digital Measures CV's or Faculty Roster
2. Publications	Digital Measures Report: Scholarship Activities
3. External grants	OIE or Digital Measures Report: Scholarship Activities
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: Annual Activity Report
7. Profile	OIE Website: Faculty Profile by Course Subject https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/faculty-data
8. Community/Public Service	Digital Measures Report: Service Activities
9. Teaching Evaluations	Digital Measures Report: Scheduled Teaching
10. Development	Digital Measures Report: Annual Activity Report
D. Students and Graduates	
1. Demographics	OIE Data Portal Program Review Report: Student Enrollment Demographics
2. Time to Degree	OIE Data Portal
3. Publications/Awards	Digital Measures Report: Publications
4. Retention Rates	OIE Data Portal: Program Review Report: Cohort Based Retention and Graduation Rates
5. Graduation Rates	OIE Data Portal: Program Review Report: Cohort Based Retention and Graduation Rates

6. Enrollment (# of Students, SCHs)	OIE Data Portal: Program Review Report: Student Enrollment Demographics
7. License Rates	Program
8. Graduate Placement	OIE Website: Graduating Student Surveys; Alumni Surveys http://prt1.uhcl.edu/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/university-survey
9. Degrees Conferred Annually	OIE Data Portal: Program Review Report: Degrees Conferred
10. Admissions	Enrollment Management Admissions Funnel Report: https://www.uhcl.edu/about/administrative-offices/emdata/enrollment-management-reports/
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

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