Appointing External Reviewers

1. After notification from the Associate Vice President for Academic and Institutional Excellence regarding the APR, the program coordinator recommends at least 4-6 external reviewers with subject-matter expertise, and employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas. The program coordinator may seek advice from the director/chair regarding recommendations for potential reviewers. The list of potential reviewers should be provided to the college/school dean and dean of the Graduate College (graduate programs) or Associate Vice President for Academic and Institutional Excellence (undergraduate programs) approximately 6 months in advance of the on-site visit.

2. External reviewers must:
   a. hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor and be actively involved in the highest level of the academic program under review;
   b. have no conflicts of interest with their review of UTRGV academic programs;
   c. not be former UTRGV or legacy institution faculty;
   d. not be scholarly collaborators with UTRGV faculty; and
   e. not be from a university where current UTRGV faculty were recently employed.

3. The following information should be submitted for the possible reviewers:
   a. Name
   b. Institution
   c. Contact Information
   d. CV or resume
   e. Justification of why the individual is appropriate to review the programs

4. The college/school dean reviews the list and adds or deletes names before submitting it to the dean of the Graduate College (graduate programs) or Associate Vice President for Academic and Institutional Excellence (undergraduate programs) for approval.

5. The dean of the Graduate College (graduate programs) or Associate Vice President for Academic and Institutional Excellence (undergraduate programs) approves the list of potential reviewers at least 6 months in advance of the on-site visit.

6. The Associate Vice President extends formal invitations to potential reviewers and secures agreements to serve.

**Number of Reviewers**

The minimum number of reviewers selected will be based on the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>1 Reviewer</th>
<th>2 Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional reviewers may be appropriate when multiple programs are under review (e.g., reviewing related bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral programs during one site visit).
Role of the External Reviewers
The external reviewers review and analyze the program’s self-study report.

The external reviewers:
1. Identify program strengths and weaknesses from the self-study report.
2. Request additional information from the program as desired.
3. Participate in a two-day on-site visit.
4. Conduct interviews of faculty, staff, administrators and other relevant parties during the on-site visit.
5. Provide a prioritized set of recommended strategies for future improvements.
6. Complete an external review report.
External Reviewer Sample Memo

Date

To: Dr. Laura Saenz
   Associate Vice President for Academic and Institutional Excellence

Through: College/School Dean Name
         College/School

Through: School Director/Department Chair Name
         School Director/Department

From: Program Coordinator/Director Name
      Program

Subject: Name of degree program Academic Program Review
         External Reviewer Nomination

In preparation for the Academic Program Review for the [program name], please see the attached list of [4, 5, or 6] nominations for external reviewers. The list indicates priority order and includes areas of expertise, name, title, institution and contact information. For each external reviewer, a justification has been provided for the selection.

[add any additional considerations regarding external reviewers]

Thank you for your consideration of this request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for selection of reviewer:**

**Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for selection of reviewer:**

**Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for selection of reviewer:

Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for selection of reviewer:

Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for selection of reviewer:

Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for selection of reviewer:

Disclosure statement of any known affiliations between proposed reviewer and UTRGV: