



## 2.7.2 Academic Program Review

Chapter 2 - General	Original Effective Date: January 2014
Section: 2.7 Academic Policies and Procedures	Date Last Reviewed: February 2022
Responsible Entity: Vice President for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs	Date Last Revised: February 2022

### I. Purpose

The academic program review is integral to academic planning and assessment efforts at UT Health San Antonio. The program review process is intended to examine, assess, and strengthen academic programs offered at UT Health San Antonio. Program reviews are a means of ensuring continuous quality improvement of UT Health San Antonio academic programs by involving a comprehensive assessment of goals, infrastructure, operations, and outcomes in relation to the institutional mission. The program review process also facilitates dialogue among the president, vice president, dean and faculty program leadership. The process provides an organized and structured opportunity for all to reflect on educational practices, and to review the role of a program in context of all the academic offerings of the school and/or institution.

### II. Scope

This policy applies to academic programs in all schools of UT Health San Antonio.

### III. Policy

UT Health San Antonio mandates that all academic programs undergo a comprehensive review on a periodic basis. The vice president for academic, faculty, and student affairs collaborates with respective school deans to establish programmatic review dates based on requirements of external accreditors and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

- A. UT Health San Antonio has a multi-tiered and multi-dimensional academic review process as a result of its public mission. The review of academic programs addresses requirements of external organizations, such as the THECB and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), as well as school and discipline-specific accrediting organizations. In addition to the external review, there is also a continual internal review process to ensure that program quality and competitiveness remains sound.

## 2.7.2 Academic Program Review

The evaluative, directional, and planning judgments resulting from program reviews are oriented within the context both of disciplinary/professional norms and department, school, and university missions. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to:

1. student enrollment, retention, and graduation;
2. student advisement, engagement, and support;
3. quality of educational programs, including assessment of student learning;
4. curricula and curricular contributions to university programs;
5. faculty and department contributions in teaching, research, creative activity, scholarly work, and service;
6. diversity and cultural proficiency;
7. quality of outreach activities and service to the institution, the profession, and the community;
8. contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs;
9. program governance and administrative support;
10. program operations and resources;
11. facilities, library, and other educational resources available to and utilized by the schools;
12. safety and adequacy of physical facilities;
13. sustainability of human and financial resources to maintain a quality program;
14. strengths and weaknesses of the program; and
15. ability to meet accreditation standards.

### B. Faculty Leadership

UT Health San Antonio academic program review is a comprehensive process that includes the participation of multiple internal and external committees. Faculty, deans, department chairs and duly constituted school committees (including admission, curriculum, and promotion) have the primary responsibility for curriculum design, development, management, evaluation, and authority to enact curricular change in accordance with school-specific accreditation standards. Changes may include credit hours (or alternative measurement methodology), curriculum objectives, content, integration, and linkages across program components, as well as, teaching methodologies, component and overall programmatic evaluations and learning outcomes.

### C. Curriculum Management

The school-specific curriculum committee or the equivalent is supported with leadership and supervision from the dean. The primary factors that shape changes to the academic curriculum include:

## 2.7.2 Academic Program Review

1. student feedback;
2. peer feedback;
3. professional accreditation;
4. research;
5. continuous faculty review of the curriculum;
6. competency based curriculum and assessment of competency; and
7. national trends.

### D. Review Committees

The diverse degree programs offered at UT Health San Antonio mandate that expertly blended curriculum committees or the equivalent with discipline-specific knowledge participate in the academic review process. The school-specific expert blended curriculum committee or equivalent is a standing committee. The expert blended review committee or equivalent is charged minimally to:

1. Oversee the evaluation, review, and recommendation for curriculum and content.
2. Conduct a periodic needs assessment of courses and programs on various criteria including change in learning content from national regional standards, interest of students and future employers in programs, and the number of graduates from programs.
3. Ensure each program has student learning outcomes that are appropriate for the program, including assessment measurement, targets, and benchmarks.
4. Assess the duplication of courses and/or programs within the school.
5. Ensure that each program director is appropriately assessing data to determine if modifications and/or changes to the curriculum are needed.
6. Ensure the curriculum has adequate hours and courses to meet the student learning outcomes based on other similar programs and/or national standards.
7. Initiate a curriculum mapping process to determine course sequencing breadth and depth of course content, student learning outcomes and degree requirements.
8. Determine if program credit hours or equivalent school-specific accreditation standard of measurement are adequate and appropriate based on accreditation and state requirements.
9. Review student course evaluations trends and trends in student concerns and issues to recommend systems level solutions.
10. Review student recruitment publications for accuracy in representing the institution's practices and policies.

## 2.7.2 Academic Program Review

### E. Faculty Council or Faculty Assembly

In accordance with the rules and regulations of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas (UT) System, each university school has a faculty council and faculty assembly or the equivalent. IHOP policy [1.4.2 Faculty Councils](#), acknowledges individual faculty councils or equivalent of the School of Dentistry, the School of Medicine, the School of Health Professions and the School of Nursing shall act as the principal policy-making and governing body regarding academic programs of each in the respective schools, subject to the Board of Regents Rules and Regulations of the UT System. The graduate faculty council, under the oversight of the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, serves as the designated faculty group charged with establishing and maintaining policies and regulations on matters of graduate education common to all programs administered by the Graduate School.

The faculty groups, as defined in school-specific bylaws, shall be responsible, for recommending to the president policies with respect to the following:

1. The admission of students and their instruction.
2. Approving the curriculum and establishing standards for academic performance, including measures to be taken in case of academic deficiencies.
3. The promotion and recommendation to the appropriate dean of candidates to be certified for graduation and the receiving of honors.

IHOP policy [1.4.3 Faculty Assemblies](#) or equivalent also provides for faculty engagement on other institutional matters. The individual faculty assemblies of the School of Dentistry, the School of Medicine, the School of Health Professions, and the School of Nursing shall be subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the authority vested in various administrative offices and subdivisions of the UT System.

The members of the faculty assembly or equivalent shall exhibit an active interest in the progress and future of the schools and shall be responsible for active participation in major planning for the schools and the campus as a whole. Faculty shall accept responsibility for performing these functions essential to the maintenance and conduct of programs of excellence in all activities of the school. Areas of interest include, but are not limited to:

1. general academic policies and welfare;
2. student life and activities; requirements for admissions and graduation;
3. honors and scholastic performance generally;
4. approval of candidates for degrees; and
5. faculty rules and procedures.

In addition, the faculty assembly may consult with the deans on general administrative affairs and on matters pertaining to the development of each school.

## 2.7.2 Academic Program Review

### F. University of Texas System/Board of Regents

The UT System Board of Regents has approval authority for new degree programs and substantive changes. Justification for changing, adding, or deleting programs requires a review by the UT System Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. The system standards used for review and approval of academic programs are derived from three overarching principles that guide decisions about program goals, design, and implementation at UT institutions.

### G. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)

In addition to the periodic review described above, the THECB has primary responsibility for the review and approval of new degree programs and review and oversight, including approval as appropriate to the level of program, offered through distance education. This process ensures the degree programs are compatible with the institution's role, scope, and mission.

### H. External Review Organizations

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) conducts an institutional evaluation for reaffirmation of accreditation every ten years and an interim review during the fifth year.

In addition, each school within UT Health San Antonio has specialized accrediting agencies. These professional and external organizations ensure that UT Health San Antonio programs conform to national standards.

## IV. Definitions

*There are no defined terms used in this Policy.*

## V. Related References

*There are no related documents associated with this Policy.*

## VI. Review and Approval History

- A. The approving authority of this policy is the University Executive Committee.
- B. The review frequency cycle is set for three years following the last review date, a time period that is not mandated by regulatory, accreditation, or other authority.

Effective Date	Action Taken	Approved By	Date Approved
01/2014	Policy Origination		
08/2017	Policy Revision		
06/2021	Policy Update/new template		
02/2022	Policy Review/discretionary edits	VP AFSA, ICPO	2/25/22

2.7.2 Academic Program Review