



MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

revised June 2024

Lamar Institute of Technology
www.lit.edu

Significant elements of this handbook were taken, with permission, from similar documents at Texas State University, Lamar University, Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, and Lamar State College – Orange.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Overview of the Program Review Process	2
Step One: Set Up	2
Step Two: Research & Analysis	3
Step Three: Self-Study Report	3
Step Four: Review & Approvals	4
Step Five: Program Review Follow-Up	4
Program Improvement Plan	4
Follow-Up Report	4
Archiving Program Review Materials	5
Appendix A: Program Review Schedule	6
Appendix B: Sample Program Review Timeline	7
Appendix C: Data & Information Sources	8
Appendix D: Guide to Writing a Program Self-Study Report	9
Appendix E: LIT Self-Study Cover Sheet	16
Appendix F: Sample Program Improvement Plan Timeline	17

Introduction

This handbook offers Lamar Institute of Technology's (LIT) educational programs guidance and step-by-step instructions on how to conduct program reviews. These reviews offer several benefits to LIT's educational programs, including opportunities to:

- analyze and evaluate a program's quality, status, effectiveness, and progress;
- identify needs, priorities, improvements, and future directions of the program;
- provide a system for programmatic oversight and transparency; and
- guide systematic development of the program.

In addition to offering useful perspectives to a program's members, the review process also provides those outside a program with an overview of program strengths, challenges, and needs. These reviews connect an individual program's annual unit planning and learning outcomes assessment to institutional strategic planning and decision-making. Program reviews create the foundation that ensures the continuous improvement of LIT programs and the efficient allocation of institutional resources.

Program reviews are ongoing and take place according to the schedule in Appendix A. The review process can be broken down into several steps or phases, which are explained in the sections that follow.

Overview of the Program Review Process

The program review process can be broken down into the following steps:

1. **Set Up.** Establish a Program Review Committee; create a review schedule or timeline; determine committee members' roles.
2. **Research & Analysis.** Collect and review program-related data and information; consult with program faculty, staff, students, Advisory Committee, and other stakeholders; analyze and consider issues, challenges, and future program directions.
3. **Self-Study Report.** Using results of research and analysis, complete a comprehensive self-study report. Self-studies include a program improvement plan based on the review's findings.
4. **Review & Approvals.** Submit the self-study report to the program Department Chair and Dean, the Academic Quality Committee (AQC), and Vice President for Instruction/Provost; after reviews are complete, collect approval signatures.
5. **Program Review Follow-Up.** Implement the improvement plan created as part of the self-study; evaluate the plan's implementation on an ongoing basis; finally, report on improvements to the program and plan for future progress.

In general, program reviews will follow these steps in order, but programs may, within reason, switch between the steps as needed.

Step One: Set Up

LIT programs are reviewed according to a fixed cycle (Appendix A) to ensure that all programs are reviewed regularly. LIT's Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (IEA) maintains the review schedule and alerts programs when their review year is approaching. The IEA Office also assists programs throughout the review process.

A program review is initiated when the program's Department Chair announces the upcoming review to faculty and staff and establishes a Program Review Committee. The committee consists of the Department Chair, all full-time faculty members in the program, and, if applicable, one member from the program's Advisory Committee. At the Department Chair's discretion, the committee may also include a program staff member, a part-time faculty member, a student enrolled in the program, and/or one external faculty member (i.e., LIT faculty member not in the program). The Department Chair typically serves as Chair of the Program Review Committee. However, the Department Chair may appoint a full-time faculty member in the program to serve as Committee Chair.

After the committee has been formed, members meet to decide on a timeline for the review (see Appendix B for sample timeline). Ideally, this schedule leaves enough time to conduct research and analysis, complete the self-study report, and route the self-study for reviews, revisions (if any), and approvals. During their initial meeting, the committee also determines each member's role (research, data collection, data analysis, scheduling, writing, etc.). Committee members may distribute tasks as they wish but should avoid placing an undue burden on any of the committee's members, including the Department or Committee Chair. The committee may adjust roles over the course of the review.

Step Two: Research & Analysis

Research and analysis are critical to the program review process. Only through data and information collected from the program and respected external sources can a program's members understand how effective their practices are. Appendix C provides a list of possible data and information sources that program members may wish to draw from to complete reviews.

In general, the information collected should be specific to the program and its courses, students, and faculty rather than the institution as a whole; however, programs should be aware of institutional data and how their data compares to that of the institution. Reviewers may also wish to compare their program to programs at peer institutions and to professional standards in their field.

In addition to collecting data, members of a program should analyze the information they have gathered and consider issues, challenges, and future directions for their program. Analysis forms the basis of data-driven decision-making that can improve a program.

Step Three: Self-Study Report

Research and analysis culminate in a self-study report, through which a program provides evidence (narrative and documentation) that it engages in ongoing, systematic, and data-driven review that leads to continuous program improvement. To assist programs in completing their self-study report, LIT has created a program review template.

The program review template guides program members step-by-step through the review process and is supplemented by instructions (Appendix D) that help authors capture as much in-depth, useful information about their programs as possible. The template also includes a section in which program members use the review's findings to create a plan for improving their program.

Self-study authors are encouraged to share their work with fellow program members to ensure that the study provides an accurate, comprehensive review of the program. Regularly scheduled meetings to discuss and work on the self-study report are also recommended. After completing the self-study, the

Program Review Committee shares its report with the program Dean, Academic Quality Committee, and Provost, who review the report in the next phase of the process.

Step Four: Review & Approvals

When the self-study has been completed, the Program Review Committee submits the report to the program Dean. The Dean reviews the report to ensure that it is an accurate and comprehensive review of the program. The Dean may request revisions to the self-study report.

After completing the Dean's revisions (if any), the Program Review Committee presents the self-study to the Academic Quality Committee at a scheduled meeting. The Academic Quality Committee conducts a review of the self-study and provides an analysis to the Provost.

The Provost reviews the self-study and analysis report and returns the findings to the Program Review Committee. The Committee Chair signs the report's cover page (Appendix E) and submits the final report to the Dean and Provost for their approval and signatures. The signed cover sheet is added to the self-study report to indicate that the report has been approved.

Step Five: Program Review Follow-Up

Program review follow-up takes place during the academic year following the initial program review. For example, if a program is reviewed during the 2022-23 Academic Year, it receives a follow-up review during the 2023-24 Academic Year. The follow-up consists of two stages: (a) a program improvement plan that takes effect after the self-study has been approved, and (b) a final report that documents improvements to the program and plans for future progress.

Program Improvement Plan

A program improvement plan is created as part of the self-study. A program's members can begin implementing their plan as soon as their self-study has been approved. The improvement plan is typically guided by the program's Department Chair and full-time faculty members, who create a reasonable timeline for implementing the improvements or "action items" listed at the end of the self-study (see Appendix F for sample timeline). Certain improvements may be implemented immediately while others may require several years to implement fully. More important than immediately implementing the action items is taking reasonable steps to engage in, assess, and document ongoing improvement.

During the follow-up year, the Department Chair and full-time faculty should meet at least once per semester (excluding summer) to assess and document program improvements. Assessment is a vital part of the program review process, and any program that needs assistance with assessment is encouraged to contact the IEA Office. Finally, programs can meet with the Dean and, if needed, the Provost to determine whether improvements can be made with available resources or if additional resources will be needed.

Follow-Up Report

The program review process concludes with a report submitted at the end of the academic year during which the program review follow-up takes place. At this time, the Department Chair or designee submits a brief report to the Dean explaining progress on improvements. To assist programs in completing this phase of the review, the program review template includes a final section (Program Review Follow-Up) where programs may enter their report. Evidence or documentation of completed or in-progress action

items may be included with the report. The report may also include adjustments to the original improvement plan that account for changes in the program and at LIT.

Archiving Program Review Materials

Program review and follow-up materials are archived in Xitracs to ensure secure storage of these materials and accessibility to members of the program, LIT leadership, and accrediting agencies. Long-term storage of these materials helps programs to document their history. This history is valuable in that it allows members of a program to trace and guide their program's evolution over time and to make further adjustments to improve the program. The IEA Office is ready to assist all programs with archiving materials generated by a review and its follow-up.

Appendix A: Program Review Schedule

LIT Program Review Schedule					
Academic Year	Allied Health & Sciences Department	Business Technologies Department	Public Service & Safety Department	Technology Department	General Education & Dev Studies Dept
2024-2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Information Technology† • Sonography† 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer Information Systems • Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire Academy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility Line Technology • Electrical Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)
2025-2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Sciences • Pharmacy Tech 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounting Technology • Cyber Security & Networking Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency Medical Services† 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heating Vent & AC • Welding Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Studies • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)
2026-2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biological Sciences • Child Care & Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cosmetology • Graphic Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Justice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer Drafting Technology • Process Operating Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)
2027-2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dental Hygiene† • Nursing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culinary Arts • Management & Entrepreneurship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency Management & Homeland Security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instrumentation Technology • Engineering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)
2028-2029	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical Assistant • Physical Therapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Analytics • Logistics & Supply Chain Management 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automotive Collision • Plumbing Technology • Mechatronics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)
2029-2030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational Safety & Health • Respiratory Care† • Radiologic Technology† 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real Estate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Academy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial Mechanics • Advanced Engine Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Curriculum Assessment (Fall & Spring)

Revised: May 2024

†Programmatic External Accreditation

Appendix B: Sample Program Review Timeline

Program: _____

Department: _____

Academic Year: _____

Item	Due Date	Completed
Department Chair informs faculty of upcoming program review and establishes Program Review Committee.	September 15	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee meets to establish timeline & roles (research, writing, scheduling, etc.)	September 30	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee conducts research to collect data & information needed for review and completes self-study report.	October 1 – January 31	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee submits self-study report to program’s Dean for recommendations & edits.	February 1 - 15	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee completes Dean’s edits (if any).	February 28	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee presents self-study report to the Academic Quality Committee.	March 1 - April 15	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Quality Committee submits self-study findings to the Provost.	April 30	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provost reviews findings and returns self-study report to Program Review Committee.	May 10	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee submits self-study cover sheet to Dean & Provost for signatures.	May 15	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program Review Committee forwards signed self-study cover sheet to IEA for archiving in Xitracs.	May 31	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix C: Data & Information Sources

This appendix provides a list of possible data and information sources that a program may wish to draw from to complete its review.

x	Data and Information Sources
	Annual Unit (Program) Plans & Assessment Reports
	Articulation agreements & dual enrollment agreements, if applicable
	Business and industry partnerships
	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
	Course cancellations
	Course requirements, descriptions, and outcomes
	Course syllabi
	Customer (Student) Satisfaction Survey
	Degree plan
	Equipment and facilities
	Graduates (number, demographics)
	Licensure/certification rates, if applicable
	Perkins annual self-evaluation
	Placement exams and assessments
	Placement/Employment rates and continuation after graduation
	Program faculty (number, demographics, full-time/part-time status, qualifications)
	Program outcomes
	Program-specific library services and resources
	Program vision and mission statements
	Program withdrawals
	Programmatic accreditation reports, if applicable
	Recruitment efforts
	Satisfaction (student, graduate and employer)
	Student evaluations of faculty and courses
	Student headcount (number, demographics)
	Student retention rates
	Texas Successive Initiative (TSI) requirements and restrictions
	Texas Workforce Commission - Labor Market
	THECB <i>Existing Program Performance Review</i> (EPPR)
	THECB Institutional Effectiveness Profile
	Transfer plans & Transfer rates (transfer into LIT and out of LIT)
	U.S. Department of Labor - Statistics
	Other (list any other sources used to review the program):

Appendix D: Guide to Writing a Program Self-Study Report

Program Review Committees can use this guide to assist them in completing their self-study, which is created using the program review template. Committees are encouraged to contact LIT's Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment for any assistance they may need in completing their self-study or the template.

PART 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

I. **Program Mission Statement**

Provide your program's mission statement. Describe how your program's mission relates to the institutional mission of LIT.

II. **Program Goals**

Describe how your program goals are actively pursuing the accomplishment of the program mission statement. Program goals typically include, but are not limited to, enrollment numbers, retention rates, time to completion, number of graduates, graduation rates, and/or transfer rates.

Example: 1) The program will graduate a minimum of fifteen students over a three-year period. 2) Program enrollment will reach 7% of LIT's overall enrollment by Fall 2023.

III. **Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)**

PLOs are program goals that focus on the end result or "outcomes" for student learning in the program. PLOs answer the question, "Upon completion of this program, the student will be able to. . ." In other words, what should the student know and be able to do upon graduation?

IV. **Program Need and/or Demand**

Describe any need or demand for your program in industry or business. (This point is particularly important in the case of technical programs.)

V. **Programmatic Accreditation**

Indicate if the program holds accreditation from a program-specific credentialing agency (CAAHEP, CoARC, etc.).

PART 2: PROGRAM CURRICULUM

I. **Degree Plans**

Provide a copy of the current degree plan(s) for this program. Are degree requirements structured to provide students in the program sufficient knowledge of best practices in the discipline and to respond to community and societal needs?

II. **General Education**

Technical Programs Only. List the general education courses in the applied associate (AAS) degree program. If the program being reviewed does not include an associate degree, enter N/A. STATE STANDARD for Compliance with Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) General Education Requirements: 100% of all AAS degrees have at least 15 semester

credit hours (SCH) of general education. Must include at least one course in each of the following Component Areas: (1) Humanities/Fine Arts: (Communication; Language, Philosophy, and Culture; and Creative Arts), (2) Social/Behavioral Science (American History; Government/Political Science; and Social and Behavioral Sciences), and (3) Natural Science/Math (Mathematics; Life and Physical Sciences).

III. **Workforce Education**

Technical Programs Only. In the Program Review Template, this and the following four questions address workforce education. Indicate your program’s compliance with Workforce Education Guidelines. STATE STANDARD for Compliance with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Workforce Education Guidelines: 100% compliance for Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees and Certificate Awards - (1) curriculum linked to business and industry; (2) capstone experience; (3) program length*; (4) compliance with Texas Workforce Education Course Manual (WECM) standards according to guidelines. [NOTE. Certain LIT programs have THECB approval for greater than the required program length (example: LIT’s Dental Hygiene program is approved at 68 SCH). If your program has THECB approval for greater length, mark “yes” for this question and indicate the approved program length (SCH) in the field below.]

IV. **Integrating Academic and Technical Education**

Technical Programs Only. In the review template, this and the following six questions address ways in which your program integrates academic and technical education. STATE STANDARD for Integrating Academic and Technical Education: Program must include writing and use of computers. Your program exceeds the state standard if you can answer “yes” to five or more of the questions, including required elements, in this section.

V. **Business and Industry Partnerships**

Technical Programs Only. In the review template, this and the following five questions address your program’s partnerships with business and industry. NOTE. Exclude Advisory Committees from this question. Advisory Committees are addressed in Part 6 of the ~~Xitrac~~ template. STATE STANDARD for Business and Industry Partnerships: Active involvement with business/industry and documented evidence of at least two of the affiliations in this section. Your program exceeds the state standard if you can answer “yes” to four or more of the questions in this section.

VI. **Employer and Student Satisfaction**

This section typically applies to Technical Programs but Academic Programs can address this issue, too. In the review template, this and the following nine questions address whether your program measures satisfaction from students and employers, including the program’s Advisory Committee. STATE STANDARD for Employer and Student Satisfaction: College measures and documents employer and student satisfaction and uses results for program improvement. Your program meets state standard if at least two measures in this section are used. Your program exceeds state standard if three or more measures are used.

VII. **Course Syllabi**

In the review template, this and the following 11 questions explore your program’s course syllabi. Technical Programs should focus on program-specific courses rather than general education.

VIII. **Transfer, Articulation & Dual Enrollment Agreements**

In the review template, this and the following six questions address your program's transferability and agreements with other institutions. Where applicable, provide a copy of any transfer plan(s) for the program. Indicate any 2+2 or 2+2+2 programs. Describe any articulation and/or dual enrollment agreements concerning this program. Also discuss future opportunities for these types of agreements. Future opportunities should be as specific and concrete as possible and not nebulous; provide evidence or documentation. **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD for Linkages and External Agreements with Schools and Universities: Program has at least one agreement in place and is pursuing others as appropriate. Your program exceeds the state standard if you can answer "yes" to four or more of the questions in this section.

PART 3: PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY / VIABILITY

I. **Student Recruitment**

What efforts are made to recruit students into the program from diverse populations? Are efforts being made to ensure fair representation in non-traditional programs (males in nursing, females in process technology, etc.)?

Texas Success Initiative (TSI)

II. Of the concentration courses in this degree plan's major requirements, list prerequisite requirements and/or Texas Success Initiative (TSI) restriction(s). Enter N/A if not applicable. Visit [Texas Education Agency's \(TEA\) website](https://www.tea.texas.gov/) for more information about TSI.

III. **Course Placement**

What assessments are used to ensure students are placed in the proper courses? Assessments may be national, state, LIT, or programmatic.

IV. **Performance Requirements**

What requirements does the program have in terms of physical or mental ability, performance assessments, safety standards, and insurability-risk management? Are there any barriers that limit students from participation in the program? Examples of barriers can include physical ability, performance tests, safety standards, insurability-risk management, etc. Before responding, check ADA requirements, as needed. If questions remain, consult with LIT's ADA coordinator.

V. **Program Viability**

Provide an evaluation of the program's sustainability using labor market information, including industry-demand, regional market, expected growth in three-five years, and mid-to-high wages, where applicable.

PART 4: PROGRAM RESOURCES

I. **Equipment**

In the review template, this and the following six questions address the equipment that supports the program. This section identifies equipment as learning materials and learning aids, computers and software, and other equipment (not to be confused with facilities, which

are addressed in the following section). **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD: Equipment meet business and industry standards and are adequate and appropriate to support the program. Questions to consider: Is equipment sufficient to support the program? Does the program require supplemental learning materials and/or learning aids? Are the availability of computers and software adequate to support the program?

II. Facilities

In the review template, this and the following two questions address the facilities that support the program, specifically the space allotted to or supporting the program. **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD: Facilities meet business and industry standards and are adequate and appropriate to support the program. Are facilities sufficient to support the program? Has enough space been allotted to the program? What is the condition of this space? Does this space meet program needs?

III. Library Services

In the review template, this and the following three questions address the library services available to your program. Are library collections at LIT/Lamar University sufficient to support the program's curriculum and information needs? Are there recommendations for additions to the library collection? Is extra funding required? How much (budget estimate)? Library materials and services may be print, digital, online, intranet, etc.

IV. Faculty Demographics

For this response, report on your program's faculty demographics for the current academic year (if available) and preceding three academic years. Include Gender, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Earned, Tenure Status, and Full-time/Part-time Status. NOTE. The IEA Office can generate a faculty report that you can then attach to the review template.

V. Faculty Credentials, Experience & Professional Development

For this response, report on your program faculty's credentials, experience, and professional development for the current academic year or most recent academic year for which information is available. To the extent possible, include full-time and part-time faculty members, along with dual credit instructors of record; full-time/part-time status; highest degree earned; discipline; years of experience teaching in field; years of "technical" experience in field; licensure/certification; professional memberships; and professional development activities for the past three years. Also indicate if current CV is on file. NOTE. The IEA Office can generate a faculty report with much of this information that you can then attach to the review template. **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD for Faculty Support: Number of faculty is adequate to support the program. For an AAS program/award, there must be one full-time instructor with primary teaching assignment in the area. For a certificate program/award, there must be an assigned program coordinator who is a full-time employee of the college and, for technical programs, qualified in an occupational/technical area.

PART 5: STATISTICAL DATA

I. Student Headcount

Report student headcount for current academic year (if available) and preceding three academic years. Include major, award sought (specialization, degree, certificate, etc.), gender,

ethnicity, and full-time/part-time status. NOTE. Visit the [Enrollment Dashboard](#) to enter data or download a PDF to attach to the review template.

II. Student-to-Faculty Ratio

Report the student-to-faculty ratio for current academic year (if available) and preceding three academic years. Calculate by dividing the total number of students by the total number of faculty per academic year.

III. Student Retention Rates

Student retention is defined as the number of first-time, full-time students who enroll in a fall semester and return the following fall. Report on the three most recent academic years for which information is available. For each year, include number in cohort, number of students retained, and retention rate (%). Also include three-year average for number in cohort, number of students retained, and retention rate (%). NOTE. The IEA Office can generate a student retention report that you can then attach to the review template.

IV. Program Withdrawals

Based on the past three years of student withdrawal feedback, what are the main reasons students are not completing the program? NOTE. For assistance in accessing or collecting this data, contact the Registrar's Office. If possible, identify the main reasons students are withdrawing and determine if your program can reduce withdrawals by making changes based on these reasons.

V. Course Offerings and Cancellations

Provide the number of scheduled course sections for each semester over the past three academic years. Indicate the total number of sections and how many were offered during the day, offered in the evening, offered as distance learning, and the number of sections that were canceled. Technical Programs should focus on program-specific courses rather than general education. NOTE. Visit the [Course Offering Dashboard](#) to enter data, download a PDF, or request a course report from IEA that you can then attach to the review template.

VI. Number of Graduates

Report the number of graduates for each degree/certificate for the three most recent academic years for which information is available. STATE STANDARD for Graduates: Program has fifteen graduates over a three-year period. Program has twenty-five graduates over a five-year period. Exclude new programs approved by the THECB and offered within the last three to five years. NOTE. Visit the [Graduate Dashboard](#) to enter data or download a PDF to attach to the review template.

VII. Transfer Rates

Report the graduate transfer rates for the three most recent academic years for which data is available. Include for each year: total number of graduates, number of graduates continuing their education*, and transfer rate (%). Also include three-year average. *Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-Up System Report. NOTE. For assistance with this section, contact the IEA Office.

VIII. Success Rates

Report on graduate placement for the three most recent academic years for which data is available. Placement is defined as program graduates who are employed and/or who continue their education. Indicate total graduates* for each academic year, number employed and/or continuing education, and success rate (%). Include three-year average. *Total graduates should be unduplicated, may not match CBM009 data (source: Automated Student & Adult Learner Follow-up Systems and CB 116). **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD for Placement: Eighty-five percent of program graduates are placed within one year of graduation (except new programs approved by the THECB for implementation and offered within the last three to five years). Exceeds standards if three-year average placement rate is ninety-five percent or greater. Special provisions will be made for programs with fewer than ten graduates. NOTE. For assistance with this section, contact the IEA Office.

IX. External Testing, Licensure & Certification

Report all external testing, licensure, or certification tests and results for the most recent three academic years for which data is available. For each year, include exam name, total number of students tested, total number passing, and pass rate (%). If this section is not applicable to your program, you can enter N/A on the review template. **Technical Programs Only.** STATE STANDARD for Licensure Pass Rate: Ninety percent of students tested on a specific licensure exam pass the exam as reported for the most recent year for which data is available (Perkins Standard) OR the percentage of students who take licensure exams and pass is no more than five percentage points below state average for last three years for the specific licensure exam. Exceeds standard if pass rate is ninety-five percent or greater. NOTE. For assistance with this section, contact the IEA Office.

PART 6: PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

***NOTE.** Not all LIT programs are required to have a Program Advisory Committee. If your program is not required to have an Advisory Committee, you may enter N/A for the questions and fields in this section. For assistance with this section, contact the IEA Office.*

I. Program Advisory Committee Members

List Advisory Committee members (name, affiliation, gender, ethnicity, and if a small or large employer). STATE STANDARD for Advisory Committee Membership: Committee membership list reflects diversity of occupational field (gender, ethnicity, small and large employers) and is chaired by a business/industry member. Program does NOT meet standard if not chaired by business or industry member.

II. Program Advisory Committee Meetings

List the dates that the Advisory Committee meetings were held within the past three academic years. Attach copies of all Advisory Committee meeting minutes from the past three academic years to the review template. STATE STANDARD for Advisory Committee Activities: Advisory Committee must meet at least once per academic year, should have a quorum present, and perform the functions outlined in the Guidelines for Instructional Programs in Workforce Education (GIPWE). Official minutes must be recorded to include information specified in the GIPWE. Exceeds standard if committee meets at least twice per academic year, activities are well documented, and appropriate format is used.

- III. **Program Advisory Committee Recommendations**
Summarize recommendations from your program’s Advisory Committee in the past three years.
- IV. **Response to Advisory Committee Recommendations**
What action was taken based on the Advisory Committee’s recommendations?
- V. **Program Advisory Committee (THECB/GIPWE)**
In the review template, this and the following 16 questions reflect the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s (THECB) mandate for effective use of Advisory Committees, as noted in the Guidelines for Instructional Programs in Workforce Education (GIPWE).

PART 7: PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- I. **Program Strengths**
Based on the review of your program, concisely identify the strengths of your program. What does your program do well? Where does your program excel?
- II. **Program Improvement Needs**
Based on the review of your program, concisely identify the needs of your program. What is needed to make your program stronger, more effective, and/or more responsive to students, graduates, faculty, staff, the community, the profession, business and industry, etc.?
- III. **Program Improvement Plan**
Based on your review of the program, develop an improvement plan to address the needs you identified in the previous section. Include estimated dates for beginning and/or completing these improvements. Ideally, the improvement plan will list concrete, realistic improvements that your program can reasonably make within the next one to five years. NOTE. You can adjust your improvement plan and estimated dates as you put your plan into action.

PART 8: PROGRAM REVIEW FOLLOW-UP REPORT

- I. **Program Review Follow-Up Report**
Your program will complete this section at the end of its program review follow-up. For example, if a program is reviewed during the 2022-23 Academic Year, its follow-up report would be completed at the end of the 2023-24 Academic Year. For this section, write a concise follow-up report describing your program’s progress in meeting the items on the program improvement plan. Documentation of completed or in-progress improvements can be attached. The report may include adjustments to the original improvement plan that account for changes in the program and at LIT. Programs are required to submit only one follow-up report but may submit multiple reports throughout and after the follow-up year to track their progress.

Appendix E: LIT Self-Study Cover Sheet

By signing below, we indicate our approval of the self-study report for the LIT program

_____ (insert program name) _____ .

Program Review Committee Chair

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Department Chair

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Dean

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Provost

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix F: Sample Program Improvement Plan Timeline

Program: _____

Department: _____

Program Review (Academic Year): _____

Program Review Follow-Up (Acad Year): _____

Action Item	Target Date	Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty subcommittee reviews current program textbooks & educational software to ensure that textbooks & software are up-to-date and reasonably priced. 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty subcommittee meets to share findings on textbooks/software. Full faculty votes on proposed changes, if any. 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Chair meets with Dean & Provost to discuss feasibility of hiring one full-time faculty member. If approved, faculty member would begin (<u>insert academic year</u>). 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If new faculty hire approved, begin faculty search. 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty members create recruitment plan to increase enrollment from regional high schools through on-site or online visits to area schools (schools TBD). 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty evaluate effectiveness of recruitment plan through surveys of regional high school students, teachers, & counselors who attended on-site or online visits. 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty evaluate effectiveness of recruitment plan by comparing enrollment in academic year after program review to enrollment over three previous academic years. 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If approved, new full-time faculty member hired. Start date (<u>insert</u>). 		<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>COMMENTS & NOTES:</p>		