



Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Application for Review of Doctoral Faculty and/or Doctoral Programs for National Research University Fund (NRUF) Eligibility

Texas public institutions of higher education identified as emerging research institutions in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) Accountability System must complete this form to apply for: (1) a comprehensive review of the faculty in five of the institution's doctoral degree programs; and/or (2) a review of its commitment to five doctoral degree programs as set forth in Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 15, Subchapter C, Section 15.43 (b)(3)(E)(iii) and (b)(3)(F)(iii).

An emerging research university that opts for the comprehensive review of the faculty in five of the institution's doctoral degree programs and/or the comprehensive review of five of its doctoral degree programs, must notify the THECB in December, at least one year in advance of the NRUF eligibility report that would certify eligibility, in order to ensure sufficient time to coordinate, schedule, and conduct site visits, and draft and disseminate reports on each of five doctoral programs and/or their faculty.

This form requires the signatures of: (1) the Chief Executive Officer, certifying the institution has already met or is on track to meet three of the other eligibility criteria listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of TAC Section 15.43; and (2) the Chief Financial Officer, certifying that the costs for the review shall be borne by the institution.

Submission

Return the completed application and supporting materials via the [THECB's Online Submission System](https://www1.theccb.state.tx.us/apps/proposals) or <https://www1.theccb.state.tx.us/apps/proposals>.

External Review

The review of either faculty and/or five doctoral programs will be based on desk reviews and site visits by external review teams. The review of a program's faculty may be based exclusively on a desk review, if the review team determines that this is sufficient for its assessment. Review teams will be comprised of a minimum of three reviewers for each two-digit CIP code of reviewed programs. If more than one program falls under the same two-digit CIP code, additional review team members may be engaged as necessary. Review team members will have expertise in the respective program discipline of the reviewed program and will be from Association of American Universities (AAU) institutions and/or programs ranked competitively with institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU). The review period is two consecutive academic years.

The review teams will summarize their findings with a written team report.

Reviewer Charge

A review team will assess faculty and programs as compared to high-quality programs at public institutions that are in the AAU. For the faculty review of a program, the review team will assess whether the faculty are comparable to, and competitive with, faculty in similar

Programs at public AAU institutions. For the doctoral program review, the review team will assess whether the institution's commitment to the program is comparable to and competitive with high-quality programs at public institutions that are in the AAU.

The evaluation shall use both qualitative assessments and quantitative comparisons, based on availability of data. The review shall be holistic: the faculty review shall include all faculty achievements, assignments, and duties; the program review shall include all facets of the program's organization.

Document History

This document was first published in February 2011. The format of the document was completely revised in February 2019. During this revision the requirements for the review were substantially preserved but refined. The document was updated in August 2019 with the following clarifications:

1. The section "Document History": was added.
2. In section "External Review," the following sentence was added: "The review of a program's faculty may be based exclusively on ..."
3. In section "Reviewer Charge," the sentence was added: "The review shall be holistic: ..."

Review Notification Form

This notification form is due in December, at least one year in advance of the next scheduled National Research University Fund Eligibility report to the Texas Legislature.

Institution Name: xxx

Program Information (program name, award name, CIP code):

1. Program: xxx
2. Program: xxx
3. Program: xxx
4. Program: xxx
5. Program: xxx

Section A – Review of Faculty

Section A is due by February 1 after submitting the Review Notification in December of the previous year.

Section 15.43 (b)(3)(E)(iii)

the ...institution may request that a comprehensive review of the faculty in five of the institution's Doctoral degree programs be conducted by external consultants selected by Coordinating Board staff in consultation with the institution and said review must demonstrate that the faculty are comparable to and competitive with faculty in similar programs at public institutions in the Association of American Universities...

Program Information

Provide the following program information *for each of the five programs selected* with this application.

Program Name:
Award Name:
CIP code:

Program Faculty Information

Faculty roster (include name, rank, highest degree earned and awarding institution, courses taught in doctoral program, and percentage of time assigned to program.)

Research Funding

Research funding information for faculty of the degree program during the last five years

- Research obligations (federal, state, private, and institutional)
- Research expenditures (federal, state, private, and institutional)

Full Curriculum Vitae for Each Faculty Member

The curriculum vitae must include the following:

- Publications, creative works, performances, etc.
- External grants received
- Awards received
- Dissertation committees chaired

Publications

- One representative publication from each faculty member published within the last three years
- Citation impact indicators

Section B – Review of Doctoral Degree Program

Section B is due by February 1 after submitting the Review Notification in December of the previous year.

Section 15.43 (b)(3)(F)(iii)

The institution may request a comprehensive review of its demonstrated *...overall commitment to five doctoral degree programs, including the financial support for Doctoral degree students, is competitive with that of comparable high-quality programs at public institutions in the Association of American Universities. The five doctoral degree programs selected for this review must be those selected...* in Section A – Faculty Review of this application or, if Section A is not part of this application, *...then any five doctoral degree programs at the institution...*

Doctoral Program Information

Provide the following program information *for each of the five doctoral programs selected* with this application.

Program Name:

Award Name:

CIP code:

Doctoral Program Description

Provide the following documentation of the institution's commitment to the doctoral program.

a. Program goals and mission

This section should be used as contextualizing narrative, serving as an executive summary to the documentation of the institution's commitment.

b. Program curriculum or curricula, if more than one track exists

- Provide the standard curriculum and sequence of courses
- Provide a list of courses and the semesters in which they were offered during the last three years.

c. Facilities

Describe the facilities supporting the program.

d. Student support

- Number and percent of current full-time and part-time students financially supported (research assistantship, teaching assistantship, scholarship)
- Average number of years of financial support provided to full-time and part-time students
- Average amount of financial support for full-time and part-time students by source (institution, research grant, etc.)

- e. Student research/teaching and publication opportunities
 - Describe support for student research and teaching opportunities and student publications and conference participation
 - Provide list of student presentations and publications for the last three years.

Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs

Include the most recent report describing the program's Characteristics, as required by the Coordinating Board for publication on the institution's website.

Award/Recognition

Include the following information on any awards or other recognitions the program has received.

- Year(s) of award/recognition
- Criteria for award/recognition
- Current and previous national rankings and source(s)
- Peer institutions and/or organizations.

Most Recent External Review

Provide a copy of the most recent external review of the doctoral program.

Signature Page

Request for Review

The Chief Executive Officer shall sign the following statements:

I certify that the statements herein are true, complete, and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I certify, if the review of faculty is requested, that the institution has already met or, as determined by Coordinating Board staff, is on track to meet three of the other eligibility criteria listed in subparagraphs (A) - (D) of TAC Section 15.43.

Chief Executive Officer

Date

Cost of Program Review

The Chief Financial Officer shall sign the following statement:

I agree that my institution will reimburse the Coordinating Board for costs associated with hiring three or more out-of-state reviewers for the comprehensive evaluation of the faculty and/or degree programs for each of the five doctoral programs selected and for costs associated with conducting site visits as part of the evaluation.

Chief Financial Officer

Date



This document is available on the [Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board website](#).

For more information contact:

Academic Quality and Workforce
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711
512-427-6200
[Email: AQW@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:AQW@thecb.state.tx.us)