

PROCEDURES FOR QUALITATIVE REVIEWS OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

I. Mandate for Reviews

At an interval not to exceed ten years, each department or other academic organizational unit offering one or more graduate degree program(s) will undergo a review of its graduate degree program(s). The sequence of reviews is established by the Graduate Faculty Committee in consultation with the Division of Academic Affairs.

Programs may request to have these periodic reviews coordinated with professional accreditation reviews. The extent to which accreditation self-study reports and the subsequent team reports and recommendations will be accepted by the Graduate Faculty Committee will depend on their appropriateness to the purposes of the Committee and UWM administration. Otherwise, all qualitative reviews of continuing programs require the submission of a Program Self-Study conforming to the requirements specified herein (see Appendix A).

Where applicable, and at the discretion of the program, the Graduate School, and the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, combined graduate and undergraduate program reviews will be conducted. However, separate reports will be prepared by the program and outside reviewers.

The resulting recommendations are subject to a follow-up review 5 years after Graduate Faculty Committee approval of the review. A two-year follow up of the full review may be required by the GPR in some instances.

The Dean of the Graduate School will notify the graduate program faculty of an upcoming program review in ample time to allow for preparation of the program self-study document and selection of external reviewers.

II. Review Cycle

A. Full-scale Reviews

1. New programs New graduate programs undergo full-scale reviews involving site visits by external consultants after five years to supply the data and evaluation required by the University of Wisconsin System for its mandated review of new academic programs. For this review, the Program Self-Study will follow the format specified by the UW System (www.uwsa.edu/acadaff/planning/guidelines.htm). The Graduate Faculty Committee will work with the Provost's Office and the Dean of the Graduate School in completing this review.
2. Continuing programs Continuing graduate programs are subject to reviews using

external consultants every ten years after the joint UWM/UW-System review. When circumstances warrant, full-scale reviews of continuing programs may be authorized by the Graduate Faculty Committee at intervals of less than ten years. Special reviews may be initiated at the request of the program, the Graduate Faculty Committee, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the appropriate college or school, or the Provost. Special reviews will be formally authorized by vote of the Graduate Faculty Committee. The Provost's office shall be informed of all special reviews by the Dean of the Graduate School.

3. Combined Program and Certificate Reviews Certification programs are subject to review every 5 years. When circumstances warrant, certificate reviews may be combined with full program reviews or follow-up reviews of the home department.

B. Mid-cycle Status Reviews

Five years after closure of the full-scale review, the Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews (GPR) will contact the Graduate Program Representative and the Department Chair to obtain a mid-cycle status report on implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Graduate Faculty Committee. Satisfactory progress in implementation of those recommendations is reported to the Committee. If the GPR finds that the progress toward implementation is not satisfactory, it shall report to the GFC with appropriate recommendations and call for subsequent follow-up reports.

Programs which are professionally accredited could opt to synchronize the submission of the report with the re-accreditation report. Some re-accreditation cycles occur every 5 years; others are on a 7 year cycle.

III. Purpose of Reviews

Graduate Program Reviews have the following purposes:

- A. To assess the essential quality of each graduate program in terms of its faculty, students, curriculum, mechanisms for ongoing assessment, and support, and to insure the continuity of program quality.
- B. To provide the Graduate Faculty Committee with a basis for the evaluation of proposals to expand, modify, or discontinue programs.
- C. To guide deans and the Provost in administrative decision-making and reporting related to graduate programs.

IV. Role of Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews

The Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews of the Graduate Faculty Committee supervises a systematic and continuing review of existing graduate programs and makes recommendations about the continuance of graduate programs. The GPR assures that reviews and subsequent responses are presented in a timely schedule for Graduate Faculty Committee action.

V. Internal Review Team

A. Selection/Membership

An Internal Review Team (IRT) is appointed by the Chair of the GPR and is composed of two members of the graduate faculty at least one of whom shall be a member of the GPR. Wherever possible, one member of the IRT shall be from a discipline related to the discipline to be reviewed.

For combined undergraduate and graduate program reviews, one or more faculty members appointed by the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee may join the IRT during the site visit, but discussion of the graduate and undergraduate programs will be separate.

B. Responsibilities

The IRT is responsible for:

1. Being fully acquainted with the Program Self-Study, the report submitted by the external consultants, and the program response to the report.
2. Meeting with the external consultants at the beginning of the site visit, attending as many meetings as schedules permit, and participating in the exit interview, when possible.
3. Presenting the report of the external consultants to the GPR, identifying any inconsistencies or inaccuracies therein, advising the GPR concerning the merits of the program response to the report, and, when necessary, reconciling the external consultants' report and the program's response. The IRT may also make recommendations for modifications to the report.
4. Presenting the report approved by the GPR to the Graduate Faculty Committee.

(Guidelines for the preparation of the report and the presentation are attached as Appendix B).

VI. External Consultants

A. Selection

At least two external consultants who are experts from the appropriate discipline are selected by the Dean of the Graduate School in consultation with the program being reviewed. Additional external consultants may be appointed depending on the number of concentrations or degrees being reviewed.

B. Responsibilities

The external consultants examine the documents from section VII.A., below, and any other information they may request, conduct the site visit, and jointly prepare a site visit report conforming to the format outlined in Section VIII, below. This report should be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School within six weeks of the site visit.

VII. Site Visit Procedures

A. Information Base

At least three weeks before the site visit, the Graduate School will distribute copies of the Graduate Program Self-Study to members of the IRT, the Provost, the Dean and Academic Associate Dean of the program being reviewed, and the external consultants. A total of ten copies of the Self-Study are required for graduate program reviews; thirteen for joint undergraduate/graduate reviews.

During the site visit, the external consultants will be given an opportunity to review course syllabi, teaching evaluations, assessment practices and data, and theses.

B. Agenda

The site visit agenda is developed by the program being reviewed in consultation with the Graduate School. It should include meetings between the external consultants and the following persons and groups: the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean and/or Associate Dean of the appropriate college or school with responsibility for the program budget, tenured program faculty, untenured program faculty, students and recent graduates. The IRT members attend as many of these meetings as possible.

Information exchanged in these meetings is of a confidential nature. It is important that non-tenured faculty and students be able to speak freely about the program(s) being reviewed.

The agenda concludes with an exit interview among the external consultants, the

IRT, the Dean of the Graduate School, the chair and graduate program representative of the program being reviewed. Invitations may be extended to the Provost's Office, the Dean and Academic Associate Dean of the appropriate School or College.

VIII. Consultants' Report and Model Format [formerly GFC Doc. 45]

A. Report

Consultants jointly prepare a report to be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School within four to six weeks of the site visit.

An executive summary will be written jointly by the external reviewers (approximately ½ page, single spaced narrative) and a rating (joint selection of one of five categories)

- A. Continuation without Conditions: This program meets or exceeds the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards. The program will continue operations taking into account recommendations from reviewers. The next full review will be scheduled in ten years.
- B. Continuation with Considerations: This program meets the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards but with minor concerns. The program's response will address the reviewer's concerns and recommendations per the guidelines in IX. Section A. The next full review would be scheduled in ten years.
- C. Continuation with Show Cause: This program does not meet the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards at this time. The program has one year to submit an action plan to the Unit Dean showing cause for continuing as described in Section X. The next review will be scheduled in five years unless the Unit Dean certifies progress. If progress is unacceptable, program will be moved to Provisional Status.
- D. Provisional Status: Due to critical issues identified during the review process, the program is asked to suspend admissions for 1-2 years. During this period, the program will be the subject of an extended internal review involving senior administrators (selected by Provost and Dean of Grad School). To reinstate admission the program needs to show credible progress in rectification of critical issues. Two year and five year internal reviews will be conducted.
- E. Discontinuation: The program should be discontinued.

In the case of a joint graduate/undergraduate review, the consultants' comments will prepare separate reports focus on the graduate program.

For convenience, the analysis section may follow the rubrics of the program self-evaluation, but consultants should use their best judgment about the necessary material to be included in the body of their report.

B. Model Format

Conclusions

The consultants' report should provide general conclusions about the state of the graduate program: the need for the program, the number and quality of the faculty and their productivity, the number and quality of its students relative to its capacity, the appropriateness of the curriculum, the quality of program assessment practices, and so forth.

Recommendations

Consultants are asked to provide specific recommendations for action by the faculty, school or college, Graduate School, and UWM administration, along with a statement of rationale for each recommendation.

A statement of rationale for each recommendation will be helpful to the GPR and the UWM faculty and administration.

Analysis

Where appropriate, consultants may wish to organize this section according to the rubrics of the program self-study:

- I. The Program
 - A. Description and Evaluation
 - B. Administrative Structure
- II. Faculty
- III. Students
- IV. Curriculum
- V. Outcomes and Assessment
- VI. Research/Scholarship Environment & Productivity
- VII. Resources
- VIII. Appendices
- IX. Supplementary Information

Attention to the major strengths of the program and issues which need to be addressed are preferable to a point-by-point response to the items of the self-study.

C. Distribution

Upon receipt, the Dean of the Graduate School forwards the report to the Provost, the School/College Dean and Academic Associate Dean, the Department Chair, and the Graduate Program Representative.

IX. Preparation of Final Review Report

A. Program Response

The Department Chair and Graduate Program Representative are charged with sharing the consultants' report with the graduate program faculty. Within six weeks of receiving the report, the graduate program will submit a response to the Graduate School. The purpose of this response is to correct errors of fact in the consultants' report and to make any necessary clarifications. Though the program may wish to initiate discussion of the conclusions and recommendations of the report, a detailed and specific status report in response to the charges of the review is not-expected until the five-year mid-cycle status report (XI, below).

The Graduate School will then forward the consultants' report and the program's response to the Internal Review Team.

B. Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews (GPR) Actions

The Internal Review Team presents the consultants' report at a meeting of the GPR. The school/college dean or his/her designee and representatives of the graduate program will be invited to this meeting. Based on the IRT's observations and the program's response, the GPR may amend the report prior to transmittal to the Graduate Faculty Committee. The GPR will clearly document changes made to the report submitted by the external consultants and the justification for such changes. The GPR also will append the department/program response if so requested.

If the current review was conducted early because of problems cited in the prior review and the current review cites continuing problems with the program, the GPR will make a recommendation regarding continuation of the program.

C. GFC Actions

If an Executive Summary recommends Provisional Status or Discontinuance the GFC will consider a full discussion.

The Graduate Faculty Committee will consider the report and recommendations of the GPR and refer its recommendations on the graduate program(s) to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean then transmits the document to the Provost (with copies to unit dean, chair, grad director, GFC and GPR chairs), which will be based on the site visit, executive summary and recommendations, GPR report and GFC approval.

X. Develop Action Plan and Assess Implementation

Develop action plan and assess implementation.

- A. Dean of individual unit meets department chair and graduate program director, and other key personnel at discretion of program; they prepare proposed action plan.
- B. Provost meets with DGS and deans of newly reviewed programs to discuss reviewer recommendations with proposed and prioritized action plans including resources. The funding contributions from all relevant administrators and the timeline for implementation should be specified in the final action plan. The provost approves the final action and resource plan.
- C. On an annual basis the provost and DGS review progress on implementation of action plans from previous years.

XI. Mid-cycle Status Reports

The Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews will request mid-cycle status reports from programs five years after GFC approval of the review. The mid-cycle status report five years after the review will use a standardized format consisting of program responses, with supporting documentation, to the recommendations approved by the GFC, and any additional information on other program changes and developments since the site visit. Appendix C provides the rationale for requesting a mid-cycle report, and guidelines for its preparation. The GPR will appoint two of its members to conduct the follow-up review. The GPR member(s) will evaluate the program's responses and may contact the program for clarification or elaboration as deemed necessary, and will present the report to the GPR. The GPR will evaluate the report and forward it to the GFC with a recommendation for scheduling the next full review or conducting an additional follow-up review.

XII. Accreditation Reviews

The Dean of the Graduate School will be apprised of all accreditation reviews of graduate programs. If the program review cannot be coordinated with an accreditation review, the Dean will read program accreditation self-study reports, meet with accreditation teams when appropriate, receive final accreditation reports and report any concerns to the GPR.

GFC Doc. 951 Appendix A

Format for Graduate Program Self-Study

Each program scheduled for review shall submit a Graduate Program Self-Study and supplementary documentation at least six weeks prior to the site visit.

In completing the Self-Study, programs are encouraged to conduct a thorough and participatory examination of the current and future status of the program. The Self-Study is intended to provide an opportunity for the program faculty to look at all facets of program operation and outcomes and engage in critical self-examination as well as formulate curricular, programmatic and research goals and objectives, benchmarks and milestones for the next 10 years. The Graduate Faculty Committee encourages programs to be forthright in identifying and addressing weaknesses in the program. In addition, the Self-Study and accompanying supplementary documentation form the foundation of information supplied to the outside reviewers.

Discussion points are indicated to guide programs in identifying issues that ought to be considered in drafting the Self-Study. The questions are intended to provide a guide to discussion and elaboration. Provide sufficient analysis, explanation, and elaboration to allow individuals unfamiliar with your program to understand its structure, curriculum, students and faculty, resource base and problems and issues.

NOTE:

For purposes of the Self-Study, Academic Year is defined as the period between September 1, year x and August 31, year x + 1.

Table of Contents

List the major sections of the report and provide titles for all appendices. Provide page numbers wherever possible.

Executive Summary

In an Executive Summary prefatory to the report, present an overview of the program, with special attention to issues facing the program and concerns for the future. The executive summary should include a statement of the program's position in relation to its mission and objectives, the School/College mission, and the University mission. It should provide the number of faculty (including clinical and adjunct faculty) currently contributing to the program and a general statement about the research or creative activity of the faculty. The summary should include an overview of the current student body, their numbers and distribution within the program (e.g., by concentration, stages of the program: coursework, thesis, preliminary examination, dissertation).

It should also succinctly describe goals and objectives for the next 10 years in three segments: (1) short term - goals and objectives for the 1st to 5th year post-review and (2) long-range goals and objectives for the 6th to 10th years. Each segment should be accompanied by a listing of benchmarks and milestones. For programs ranked nationally or regionally, it should report the most current ranking, or other relevant citations or ratings/benchmarks, and where it expects to be in rank in 10 years.

Contact Persons

At the end of the Executive Summary list the names of the Dean (and where appropriate, Associate Dean) of the school or college that houses the program, the name or names of the preparers of the self-study report, and faculty and staff contact people with telephone numbers and e-mail addresses.

I. The Program

A. Description and Evaluation

Program Array: List the baccalaureate and graduate degree program(s) currently offered by the department or program, and plans for the next 10 years.

Describe the current graduate program(s) with particular attention to its unique qualities, special features, and strengths. Comment on developments in the program since its last review and implementation of recommendations from previous reviews. In addition, comment on the programmatic and curricular improvements and enhancements being planned for the next 10 years, and explain the rationale for the refinements.

Where appropriate, comment on related programs at UWM (including undergraduate and other graduate degree and certificate programs in your academic unit). Address issues of articulation, duplication, or collaboration with other programs, as those categories represent either problems or opportunities. If they are relevant, discuss similar programs at other institutions in Wisconsin and elsewhere, in terms of competition or collaboration with those programs.

Discuss the current and future projected demands for the program, including trends in the number and quality of applicants and the placement success of its recent graduates. Detail new trends in the field and the program's position/response to those developments. (Please refer to any surveys of data available on trends and projections.)

What mechanisms are in place for ongoing evaluation of program structure and objectives? What improvements have resulted from internal program assessment?

Identify any obstacles to achieving the program's objectives which have arisen in

recent years. What steps have been contemplated or taken to deal with these problems?

Discuss the challenges and opportunities present in the modes of instruction employed by the program (conventional, student cohort, on-line). What changes in modes of instruction are being contemplated by the faculty?

If the program is currently accredited, summarize the findings of any accreditation reports since the last GFC review. What was the program's response to the accreditation report? How is the program positioning itself with respect to the next accreditation review?

Provide critical analyses of content and instructional methodologies in light of scientific developments, technological innovations, and knowledge advancement.

B. Administrative Structure

Describe the administrative and governance structure of the program. How does the structure promote the achievement of the program's objectives? What changes, if any, need to be made in preparation for the next 10 years of refinements and upgrades? Discuss any problems of organization or management within the program and how these are going to be addressed. Discuss the nature and quality of interactions with its department(s), school or college (including school or college Graduate Program Committee), with governance bodies, and with the Graduate Academic Programs and Student Services area of the Graduate School. What changes are necessary, if any, to facilitate the program's development over the next 10 years?

Describe the role and responsibilities of the graduate program representative with respect to the impending changes.

II. Faculty

List current members of the Graduate Faculty by name, rank, teaching and research specialization.

Comment on any specific concerns regarding program faculty as well as any signal achievements that directly impact on the graduate program.

Discuss the effect of recent hires and the departure or retirement of faculty on the program. What has the program done to promote diversity among the faculty? What is the role of junior faculty in the program?

Where appropriate discuss the role of adjunct and other non-faculty personnel in the instructional program. What procedures are in place to assure the quality of instruction

provided by instructors who are not members of the program graduate faculty?

III. Students

Assess the number and quality of applicants to the program. What trends in application patterns have been discerned? Describe the criteria and procedures used to review and select applicants for admission. What measures can be taken to improve the caliber of students recruited and enrolled; to significantly increase rates of retention and graduation; and to realize timely progress to degree?

Discuss recruitment strategies. What measures have been taken to increase the diversity of the student body and how successful have those efforts been? What measures are in place to track and monitor program efforts to increase diversity?

Insert Applications/Admissions table (supplied by the Graduate School).

Insert Incoming G.P.A. and Test Scores Table (supplied by the Graduate School).

Estimate optimum enrollment in your program(s) and estimate/compare with the status of the current student body: what percentage are taking coursework, completing a master's capstone experience, at PhD preliminary exam stage, doctoral dissertators? Estimate the completion rate for students in your program(s). Discuss any perceived problems with retention/completion and describe any steps the faculty has taken to correct these problems.

Insert Enrollment table (supplied by the Graduate School).

Describe the advising system within the program and other ways by which expectations and opportunities are conveyed to students. Explain the program's strategies for mentoring graduate students and socializing them as apprentice scholars or professional practitioners. How is student progress toward the degree monitored by the program faculty?

Discuss the involvement of graduate students in faculty research (publications and presentations, etc.); how does the program foster an intellectual community?

Comment on any perceived pattern of exceptions (course overloads, graduate dean's approval to continue, etc.) and appeals particular to students in your program(s). Have these issues been addressed by the faculty and with the Dean of the Graduate School?

What is the participation of students in the governance of the program?

Comment on the special achievements of students and graduates of the program.

Discuss the support of graduate students through departmental and university fellowships and assistantships. Describe any problems associated with graduate assistantships. How

are graduate assistants trained and supervised?

If applicable, insert Student Financial Assistance table (supplied by the Graduate School).

Describe how student learning experiences reflect knowledge advancement and technological innovations and foster independent critical thinking.

IV. Curriculum

Describe the general structure and any special or unique curricular aspects of the program. Include a discussion of programs such as colloquia and visiting scholar/speakers series that enrich the regular curriculum.

Detail curricular modifications since the last GFC review and/or changes being contemplated. Explain the reasons for these changes. What measures are in place to ensure that curricula in the program reflect the state of the art/science in the program of study?

Discuss the program’s reliance on U/G courses, the frequency of offering courses for the program, and any specific challenges the program faces in delivering its curriculum.

How are issues related to diversity reflected in the curriculum?

Doctoral Programs Only: Describe the structure of the preliminary examination.

If applicable, for each degree offered by your program, indicate the number of students graduated in each area of specialization or concentration for each of the last ten academic years. See example table below.

Graduates by concentration in the [degree program name]

Name of concentration	AY 01-02 (e.g.)	AY 02-03	AY 03-04	AY 04-05	AY 05-06
Name of concentration	AY 06-07	AY 07-08	AY 08-09	AY 09-10	AY 10-11

If applicable, for each area of specialization or concentration, list the courses for which

graduate students may receive credit.

V. Outcomes and Assessment

Describe the role of faculty in defining expected student learning outcomes and in creating strategies to determine whether those outcomes are achieved (including student evaluation of courses, faculty oversight of outcomes and competencies, alumni evaluation and tracking, and any unique mechanisms of evaluation). What improvements have resulted from student outcomes assessment?

Describe the ways in which faculty and administrators monitor and review the effectiveness of the program’s assessment instruments for student learning outcomes.

Detail the evaluation processes applied by the faculty to program milestones: master’s thesis or project, qualifying examinations, comprehensive examinations, dissertation proposal and defense.

For each graduate program, to the extent possible, provide a table showing the number of students who, upon graduation, for each year since the last program review, have

- a. Pursued the PhD or other terminal degree, *or obtained employment in*
- b. Higher Education
- c. Primary and secondary education
- d. Government
- e. Industry
- f. Professional
- g. Self-employed
- h. Postdoctoral research & training
- i. Other (explain)

Example: Outcome Data for Master’s Graduates AY 2002-2011

	Academic Year ending August 20xx									
Field	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Further grad study (omit this row for doctoral programs)										
<i>Employed in</i>										
Higher Education										
Primary/Secondary Education										
Government										
Industry										
Professional										
Self-employed										

Postdoctoral training										
Other (explain in footnote)										

Briefly indicate how and when this information was collected.

Insert Degrees Awarded Table (supplied by the Graduate School).

See Appendix C for additional information on graduates of the program.

VI. Research/Scholarship Environment and Productivity

Research/scholarship context of the Discipline: Describe what constitutes research and scholarship in the discipline and sub-specialties of faculty in the program. Identify the recognized benchmarks for research and scholarship in the discipline.

Funding context for research/scholarship: Describe potential sources of funding to support research and scholarship in the discipline. List and describe the funding secured for research, scholarship, and program development by faculty and students. Include internal and external grants, special awards and fellowships, scholarships, research and graduate assistantships, etc.

Accomplishments and impact: Highlight faculty and student research activities, scholarly achievements and professional recognitions. Describe how these have contributed to the program’s overall quality, distinction and reputation. Address the impact of these accomplishments on the discipline and on UWM’s urban mission.

Future directions: Identify goals for faculty and student research/scholarship that the program would like to achieve in the next ten years (e.g., increase publications and other avenues for dissemination, increase extramural funding, increase student involvement in research).

VII. Resources

Discuss any resource issues affecting the quality of the program. What creative/innovative strategies can be adopted to overcome resource constraints and foster faculty and student development over the next 10 years?

Where appropriate, describe how external funding is used to support graduate education.

If applicable, insert External Funding and/or Internal Research Awards tables (supplied by the Graduate School).

Assess the adequacy of the physical facilities available to the program (classrooms, laboratories, offices, and so forth).

Detail any concerns about equipment and instruments.

Describe the clerical, curatorial, and technical support of the program. Assess the adequacy of the support staff in terms of numbers and quality.

Discuss the adequacy of the library and information resources and services.

VIII. Appendices

- A. GFC documents from the most recent full and follow-up reviews (supplied by the Graduate School).
- B. Current Graduate School Bulletin copy for the program(s). This includes a description of current program requirements and courses (supplied by the Graduate School).
- C. Degree Completion Detail
 - 1. For master’s programs with multiple capstone options, provide numbers of students who graduated under each option (e.g. thesis, project, comprehensive examination) for each academic year since the last review. See example table below.

Graduates by capstone option in the [degree program name]

Capstone Option	AY 01-02	AY 02-03	AY 03-04	AY 04-05	AY 05-06
Thesis					
Comprehensive Examination					
Project					

Capstone Option	AY 06-07	AY 07-08	AY 08-09	AY 09-10	AY 10-11
Thesis					
Comprehensive Examination					
Project					

2. For those who completed a thesis or project, provide the following information:
 - a. Name of advisor
 - b. Title of thesis or short description of project
 - c. Resulting publications, if any
 - d. Professional employment or further training
 1. Initial position and employer, or
 2. Name of institution where student is pursuing additional graduate degree

See sample format below.

Master's Degree Recipients: Thesis or Project Option, Academic Year 06-07

Student Name:

Advisor:

Thesis Title or Project Description:

Resulting Publications:

Post-graduate employment (position title, employer):

Additional graduate study (degree program, name of institution):

3. For each student receiving the doctorate since the last review, provide the following information:
 - a. Name of advisor
 - b. Title of dissertation
 - c. Resulting publications, if any
 - d. Professional employment or further training (initial position and employer)

See sample format below.

Doctoral Degree Recipients Academic Year 06-07

Student Name:

Advisor:

Dissertation Title:

Resulting Publications:

Post-graduate employment (position title, employer):

- D. Course Offering Summary for Currently Active Courses Available for Graduate Credit (Excluding thesis, project, dissertation and independent study)

(This information will be supplied by the Graduate School.)

- E. Library report (supplied by the Golda Meir Library)

- F., G., etc. Include other appendices as necessary.

IX. Supplementary Documentation

The following materials should be supplied under separate cover:

- A. Copies of written materials that describe program policies, procedures, or requirements such as student handbooks or program brochures.
- B. Three complete sets of updated vitae of all faculty members involved in the graduate program(s) being reviewed (one for the Graduate School, one for each of the consultants).

Summary of Data Elements for Tables – Supplied by the Graduate School

Applications/Admissions Table

Applied/Admitted/Refused/Other and Regular/Probation/Total
By semester

Incoming G.P.A and Test Scores Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall:
Average incoming g.p.a (applicants and admitted students) by application term
Average GRE (applicants and admitted students) by semester (include max. possible scores)
Average TOEFL (applicants and admitted students) by semester (include max. possible scores)
Average IELTS (applicants and admitted students) by semester (include max possible scores)

Enrollment Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall
New/Continuing/Total; Male/Female/Total; Ethic distribution for US
residents/International/Total
All by semester

Student Financial Assistance Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall
TA/RA/PA/Fellow (Graduate School, Dissertation, AOP)/Chancellor's Scholar each fall

Degrees Awarded Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall
Breakdown by ethnicity and gender, totals
By semester

External Funding Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall
Grant Proposals/Research Award \$/Instructional Award \$
By AY

Internal Research Awards (e.g. Research Committee Awards, Research Growth Initiative)

Include for program and Graduate School overall
By AY (Number of awards and \$)

Course Offering Summary

Graduate student enrollment in courses offered for graduate credit, by semester

GFC Document 951 - Appendix B

The Internal Review Team (IRT) Report to the Sub-Committee on Graduate Program Reviews (GPR)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Internal Review Team (IRT) is responsible for:

1. Being fully acquainted with the Program Self-Study, the report submitted by the external consultants, and the program response to the report.
2. Meeting with the external consultants at the beginning of the site visit, attending as many meetings as schedules permit, and participating in the exit interview, wherever possible.
3. Presenting the external consultant's report to the GPR, identifying any inconsistencies or inaccuracies therein, advising the GPR concerning the merits of the program response to the report, and, when necessary, reconciling the external consultants' report and the program's response. The IRT may also make recommendations for modifications to the report.
4. Presenting the report approved by the GPR to the Graduate Faculty Committee (GFC).

II. THE PRESENTATIONS

1. Sources of Information

- Graduate Program Self-Study Document
- Two-Day Site Visit
- Consultants' Report
- Department/Program's response to consultants' report

NOTE:

In preparing the IRT written report (no more than 5 pages), please address any conflict in sources of information related to the conclusions and recommendations.

2. Preparing the written report for presentation to GPR

- The report should provide sufficient general information about the program and the programmatic context within which the Consultants' recommendations are made.

- In addition, the report should provide a critical review of the recommendations made by the consultants. The IRT report should rank order/prioritize the recommendations, and provide the rationale for the way they have rank ordered the recommendations.
- The IRT report should also identify any inaccuracies, clarify contradictions, and suggest revisions to the Consultants' Report, if any, and discuss the merits of the evaluation.
- Program representatives may take issue with evaluations of the program or interpretations of evidence in the Consultants' Report and offer alternative evaluations or interpretations. Further, program representatives may object to specific wording of conclusions or recommendations because they believe that the wording gives inappropriate emphasis to an issue or that the wording is likely to cause misinterpretation by other readers. The IRT should take note of any and all concerns, but should not feel obligated to make any suggestions on behalf of the program. If program representatives indicate substantial conflicts in evaluation or interpretation in their written response to the consultants' report, the IRT may wish to offer an independent assessment of both views, and take special care in providing a full rationale for the items in contention. For example, the IRT may candidly note that the program objects to a conclusion or recommendation and offer reasons for the IRT rejecting the program's view.

3. At the GFC meeting

- Present an abbreviated version of the written report to GPR, followed by a summary of key points of the discussion at GPR.
- IRT members should be prepared to answer questions.

4. Importance of Internal Review Team (IRT) Members

Graduate programs are reviewed only once every 10 years except for new programs, which are reviewed every 5 years for the first 10 years. These reviews are an important tool for maintaining the quality and integrity of graduate programs. Program faculty, the Graduate School, GPR and the GFC invest considerable time and resources in these reviews. This investment is justified only if the review report is of sufficient quality to serve as a guideline for improving graduate programs. IRT members play a critical in assuring that the review process serves this important function. The Golden Rule applies here: invest the same effort and care in preparing the IRT report that you would want when your program is under review.

GFC Doc. No. 951 - Appendix C

The Mid-cycle Status Report

The mid-cycle status report, so named because of its occurrence in the 5th year after the most recent program review and site visit, is intended as a self-assessment measure for the academic programs/departments. The primary purpose of the exercise is to assist academic units and the home departments in their review of progress made (or lack thereof) towards the realization of program goals and objectives, and the accomplishment of identified milestones, all of which were established at the most recent regular program review.

This review will examine whether,

- i. The program goals and objectives that were set about 5 years ago remain appropriate and realistic for the program to work towards. If not, specify the factors found to be responsible for the need for change, and the action taken to address the change;
- ii. The progress made towards the accomplishment of the stated goals and objectives. If no or less than expected progress had been accomplished, explain the reasons for this, and describe any corrective action taken; and
- iii. Any other pertinent observations or comments.

The report to be submitted will address each of the points notated above.