

University of Utah Graduate Council Program Reviews

Description

and

Procedures

The Graduate School
302 Park Building
201 South Presidents Circle
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016

Persons Involved with Graduate Council Program Reviews

David S. Chapman
Dean of the Graduate School
phone: (801) 581-6925
e-mail: david.chapman@gradschool.utah.edu

Frederick Rhodewalt
Associate Dean of the Graduate School
phone: (801) 585-7199
e-mail: fred.rhodewalt@gradschool.utah.edu

Sandra F. Haughey
Operations Manager
phone: (801) 585-9873
e-mail: sandy.haughey@gradschool.utah.edu

University of Utah Graduate Council Program Reviews

Description and Procedures

Produced Winter Quarter 1996
Revised Spring Semester 2009

The Graduate School
302 Park Building
201 South Presidents Circle
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Elements of an effective program review	2
Participants in program reviews and their responsibilities	3
Steps in the Graduate Council program review	5
Nominating potential reviewers	7
Program self-study	8
Sample Department Review Sheet	9
Degree completion/attrition data form	14
Scheduling external and internal reviewer site visits	15
Sample itinerary for external reviewers	17
Guidelines for external and internal reviewers	18
Report format for external and internal reviews	21

Introduction

All undergraduate and graduate degree granting programs at the University of Utah are subject to regular review. Reviews for programs with both graduate and undergraduate components or that award only graduate degrees are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council and are administered by the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School. The Undergraduate Council reviews programs that are solely undergraduate in nature.

These reviews are characterized by a general approach: they are collegial in the broadest sense of the term and are based on the concept of peer review; they are scholarly in that they seek to define questions whose answers will increase understanding of the programs; they are comprehensive in that they view the programs under review as being connected both to other programs within the university and to the intellectual issues of the discipline at large; and finally, they are dynamic in that they result in actions that will improve undergraduate and graduate education.¹

Purpose

Educational units within universities require regular scrutiny and self-examination to improve, and the systematic review of academic programs is an integral part of this process of improvement. The purpose of program review is to improve quality education in the State of Utah by strengthening established programs and eliminating or upgrading those, which fail to meet acceptable standards

Program review has several associated objectives or goals: (1) For the university, program review helps in long-range planning by providing information about the size and stability or vitality of a program, its faculty resources and student demand, its equipment and space needs, its strengths and weaknesses, and its contribution to the mission of the institution. It helps set goals for the future and ensures that overall academic plans and budget decisions are based on real information and agreed-upon priorities, not vague impressions. (2) For the educational unit, program review provides a mechanism for change and improvement by creating a structured, scheduled opportunity for a program to be examined. The mechanism should be well-reasoned, far-seeing, and as apolitical as possible. (3) From an external point of view, program review provides a mechanism for universities to be accountable to society (state government, funding agencies, donors, taxpayers, and tuition-paying students) for their activities and for the quality of their programs.

¹ Sections in "Introduction," "Purpose," and "Elements of an Effective Program Review" are adapted from Academic Review of Graduate Programs - A Policy Statement, Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, D.C., 1990, pp.26.

Elements of an Effective Program Review

1. Program review is initiated and administered within the institution.
2. Program review is evaluative, not just descriptive. More than the compilation of data on a particular program, it requires academic judgments about the quality of the program and the adequacy of its resources. It goes beyond an assessment of the minimum standards adequate for licensure or accreditation to evaluations of quality by peers and recognized experts in the field.
3. Review of programs is forward-looking; it is directed toward improvement of the program, not simply assessment of its current status.
4. Departments engaged in program review are evaluated using academic criteria.
5. To the extent possible, program review is an objective process. It asks departments to engage in self-studies, which assess, as objectively as possible, their own programs. It brings faculty members from other departments and from outside the institution to review the self-studies and to make their own evaluations, using independent judgments. It is part of an established, public process in which all programs are similarly reviewed.
6. Program review is an independent process, separate from other reviews. Reviews conducted by regional or professional accrediting associations, licensing agencies or budget committees are separate and distinct. Data collection and parts of the department self-study may often serve a number of review purposes and thus program review will often be scheduled to coincide with an accreditation or other external review. But to be effective, program review must be a unique, identifiable process, which stands on its own, draws its own set of conclusions, and directs its recommendations to the only individuals who have the power to improve programs: the faculty and administrators of the institution.
7. Most important of all, program review results in action. Growing out of the reviewers' comments and recommendations, the institution develops a plan to implement the desired changes on a specific, agreed-upon timetable. This plan is linked to the institution's budget and planning process, to help ensure that recommended changes actually get made, that necessary resources are set aside, and that the program's goals fit into the institution's overall academic plans.
8. Successful program review, then, is a process of evaluation, which has all of the above characteristics. It provides answers to the following kinds of questions:
 - Is the teaching and training of students effective and useful?
 - Is the department advancing the state of the discipline or profession?
 - Does the program meet the institution's goals?
 - Does it respond to the profession's needs?
 - How is the program assessed by experts in the field?

Participants in University of Utah Program Reviews and their Responsibilities

Program review involves the participation of two groups of consultants: (a) an internal committee consisting of faculty members drawn from other departments of the University of Utah; and (b) external consultants who are professors of national reputation in the discipline under review.

Internal committee members are appointed by the Graduate School but are selected in part based on names suggested by the department under review. As a general rule there are three faculty members on each internal review committee. The internal committee has two major functions: (a) to provide judgment on departmental programs from the viewpoint of colleagues at the University of Utah; and (b) to review in detail the academic program of students and to assess the achievement of students and the quality of work accepted toward an undergraduate or graduate degree. Internal committees are encouraged to focus their attention on questions that require considerable familiarity with departments and their relationship to other departments and to the activities of the total university.

External reviewers are faculty members from other universities who are nationally recognized educators and scholars in their respective subject fields. External reviewers are appointed by the Graduate School but are selected in part based on names suggested by the department under review. Three external reviewers are selected to visit the University of Utah. The task of the external reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of quality and effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate programs. This evaluation is concerned primarily with the quality of education actually achieved by students and includes, but is not restricted to, an assessment of the quality of faculty, the adequacy of curriculum offerings and program options, the existence of policies and practices in support of students, adequacy of the departmental budget, and the adequacy of staff support, physical facilities, library resources, equipment, and research facilities. In addition, the review considers the justification of the program in terms of such factors as employment demand, potential student population, and service functions performed by the department.

As an aid to the external and internal review teams, packets of documentary material (the program self-study) are prepared by the departments under review and made available through the Graduate School to reviewers in advance of the review. These materials follow a format described later in this document and include such information as (1) departmental goals and mission plan, (2) faculty vitae, (3) course listings and program options, (4) admission policies and degree requirements, (5) statistical data on enrollment, degrees granted, class size, etc. (6) financial data, and (7) a description of research facilities, equipment, space, library holdings, etc.

The external and internal review teams each prepare a written report based on interviews, on-site studies, and the appropriate documentary materials are prepared by the internal review committee and the external reviewers and submitted to the Associate Dean of the Graduate School. The dean then transmits copies of the reports to the department chair and dean of the college and requests written responses after they have had the opportunity to discuss the

reports with all department faculty. The chairman is expected to share all reports with all members of the regular faculty.

All documents are then submitted to an ad hoc committee of the Graduate Council charged with synthesizing the reports and producing a summary report for the program review. The ad hoc committee meets with external consultants when they are on campus and with the internal committee when it submits its report to the Dean of the Graduate School. The ad hoc committee may, but is not required to, meet with the college dean or the department chair to clarify issues raised in the various reports. The ad hoc committee submits its report with commendations and recommendations, along with all materials on which they are based, to the Graduate Council, which debates and takes appropriate action on the reviews.

All Graduate Council actions on reviews are reported to the cognizant Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The vice president, who has not been directly involved in the program review until this stage, then meets with the department/program chair, college dean, and dean and associate dean of the graduate school, to discuss program review recommendations. A memorandum of understanding of this wrap-up meeting for the program review and the Graduate Council report of the review are transmitted in full to the University Senate and to the State Board of Regents by the vice president.

Staff support and expenses for preparing the program self-study are borne by individual departments or units. The Graduate School provides honoraria, travel expenses, housing, and meals for external reviewers invited to the campus. Internal committee members do not receive honoraria for their work.

Steps in the Graduate Council Program Review and Approximate Timelines.

1. A program is informed formally of a scheduled Graduate Council program review during the academic year prior to the year of the actual review. Note that a seven-year plan for reviews is maintained in the Graduate School and in the office of each academic dean.
2. The Associate Dean of the Graduate School and staff meets with the program chair and staff to review procedures and set timelines for the review. This meeting should occur no later than spring semester in the academic year preceding the review.
3. The program is requested to:
 - a. prepare a self-study (see later section for format and description),
 - b. supply the Graduate School with names and contact information of at least 5 potential external reviewers,
 - c. supply the Graduate School with names and contact information of at least 5 potential internal reviewers.
4. Following meetings with programs, the Graduate School contacts and appoints external reviewers and internal reviewers. The Graduate School informs the program chair and the college dean of the names of the respective review teams no later than spring semester in the year preceding the review.
5. The program, in coordination with the Graduate School, arranges detailed itineraries for external and internal reviewers. Visits of external visitors should end with an exit interview with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and with the ad hoc committee of the Graduate Council assigned to that particular program review. External reviewers are requested to submit their reports within one month of visiting the University.
6. The internal review committee, upon completion of its work, delivers its report to, and discusses the report in person with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and with the ad hoc committee of the Graduate Council assigned to that particular program review. The internal review team is requested to submit its report within one month of visiting the department.
7. The Graduate School receives written reports from the external and internal review teams, which are then sent to the department/program chair and college dean for a written response. A period of one month is provided for replies.
8. Both reports, plus responses from the department chair and college dean and the department's self-study are given to a Graduate Council ad hoc committee which is responsible for writing the synthesis report on the program review. The ad hoc committee includes one person assigned from the Undergraduate Council. In advance of writing the formal report the ad hoc committee meets with the Dean and

Associate Dean of the Graduate School to discuss main findings of the review. At this meeting the report is scheduled for discussion at a specific Graduate Council meeting, leaving generally one month for ad hoc committee deliberation and writing.

9. All Graduate Council members are given the program review synthesis report together with all supporting documents. The Graduate Council discusses, amends, and approves the report.
10. The Graduate Council report is distributed to the department chair and to the college dean for correction of factual information. The program is requested to inform the Graduate School of significant actions taken since the inception of the review and not contained in other supporting documents.
11. Wrap-up meeting. After the Graduate Council report is submitted to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, the department chair, college dean, and Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School meet with the cognizant vice president to discuss program review recommendations. For each recommendation that is deemed achievable within the resources of the institution, responsibilities and timelines are established for implementing the recommendation.
12. The Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean are available to attend a program faculty meeting to discuss the review process in general and the recommendations and wrap-up memorandum in particular.
13. The summary Graduate Council report and the wrap-up recommendation are sent to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences for forwarding to the Academic Senate, Board of Trustees and the State Board of Regents as information items.

Nominating Potential Reviewers

External Reviewers

The program should supply the Graduate School with a list of five potential external reviewers. They should be faculty members from other universities who are recognized scholars and teachers in the fields under review. Please consider gender, ethnic, and age diversity when suggesting potential reviewers. Also, please report any prior connections with potential reviewers that may raise concerns about the reviewers' partiality. Note that the Graduate School, not the department, contacts reviewers. The Graduate School also may select reviewers not on the department list.

For each person nominated, briefly describe the qualifications (i.e., relevant academic and professional experience) that make this person an appropriate site visitor for your unit. In order to avoid overlap and ensure appropriate coverage of the department, specify the person's principal area of scholarly activity in terms of the areas represented by the department being reviewed (e.g., history of the American West, organic chemistry, environmental geology).

Internal Reviewers

The program should supply the Graduate School with a list of five potential internal reviewers. So as to avoid conflict of interest, internal reviewers should not be based in the same college as the program being reviewed. Please consider gender, ethnic, and age diversity when suggesting names.

For each person nominated, briefly describe the qualifications and relationship to your department that make this person an appropriate internal committee member for your review.

Format for Listing Potential Reviewers

To aid the Graduate School in contacting potential reviewers, please supply the following information for each of the suggested external and internal reviewers, and each of the thesis/dissertation reviewers or reviewing departments.

Name:	Phone:
Title/Rank:	Fax:
Dept./Academic Unit:	e-mail:
University:	
Address:	

Program Self-Study

The self-study is prepared by the faculty of the department, college, or program and is both descriptive and evaluative; it provides basic information on the nature of the program and gives the faculty's assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses. A program self-study is the faculty's opportunity to scrutinize itself, to publicize its accomplishments and examine its flaws. It is also a chance to explain itself and to demonstrate how it is viewed by its peers. A self-study should lead reviewers through the following four questions:

- What do you do?
- Why do you do it?
- How well do you do it, and what is the measure of your success?
- What difference does it make whether you do it or not?

Eight copies of the program self-study must be provided to the Graduate School. One copy is sent by the Graduate School to each of the three external reviewers and each of the three internal reviewers. Two copies are retained in the Graduate School. The program bears the cost of producing the self-studies.

The following list is a suggested organization for the self-study. It is not an exhaustive list and individual programs may depart from the suggested format and/or include additional information where appropriate. Wherever possible, data should be provided for the period since the last Graduate Council review (normally seven years).

1. Program Overview

1.1 Program mission and organization.

This is an introduction to the program, its purpose, organization and history.

1.2 Program planning (centerpiece of the self study!)

Include goals of the program, strategic or long-range plans. Include areas of teaching, research, or public service in which the program regards itself as especially outstanding and areas of teaching, research, or public service in which the program would like to improve. Give an outline of intended changes in the scope and/or direction of undergraduate or graduate education (new degrees, shifts in organization, new areas of specialization), and the resources at your command to make those changes.

1.3 Previous review and actions

Include the Graduate Council report to the Academic Senate from your last review. Provide narrative on actions taken since the review.

1.4 Department review sheet

Include Department Review Sheet with information on student enrollment, majors, degrees granted, faculty headcount, and salary averages by rank. This document is prepared by the Institutional Analysis Office and distributed to you by the Graduate School (see sample, pg. 9). Provide narrative interpretation of the review sheet where appropriate.



Office of
BUDGET & INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Department Review by Academic Year

2003-2004 2004-2005 2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008

Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

Full Professors	23	28	31	30	33
Associate Professors	12	8	6	6	4
Assistant Professors	6	6	5	6	6
Instructors	0	0	0	0	0

Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.

Research Expenditures (Department)	\$11,282,752	\$11,410,438	\$11,777,838	\$11,952,891	\$13,260,054
Research Expenditures (College)	\$29,197,529	\$32,373,556	\$31,456,325	\$31,467,436	\$34,209,007

Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.

Lower Division	18,931	18,873	17,443	17,299	17,074
Upper Division	5,618	6,226	5,798	5,975	5,969
Total Undergraduate	24,549	25,099	23,241	23,274	23,043
Basic Graduate	195	256	468	155	68
Advanced Graduate	1,317	1,593	1,976	1,290	1,363
Total Graduate	1,512	1,849	2,444	1,445	1,431

Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

Undergraduate Courses	5.14	5.01	5.08	5.07	NA
Undergraduate Instructors	5.29	5.17	5.15	5.19	NA
Graduate Courses	NA	5.30	5.79	5.79	NA
Graduate Instructors	NA	5.55	6.00	6.00	NA

Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

Pre-Majors	328	306	304	271	262
Full Majors (Including Intermediate)	551	566	545	531	519
Master's	7	6	8	8	4
Doctoral	53	60	62	65	63

Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

Bachelor's	168	179	161	145	179
Master's	4	3	2	5	3
Doctoral	14	6	8	10	10

Office of Budget & Institutional Analysis (OBIA)

110 Park Building, 201 South President's Circle, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Office: 801-581-6948 | Fax: 801-581-7541 | Email: info@obia.utah.edu

The University of Utah © - [Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy Statement](#)

2. Faculty
- 2.1 Faculty profile
Summary of faculty profile providing information on the number of faculty (tenure/non-tenure rank; regular and research/clinical; full-time and part-time); faculty hired or retired during the past five years, or no longer with your program; average age; age range and distribution.
- 2.2 Faculty diversity
Please provide a description of the diversity of your faculty (gender, ethnicity). Describe departmental efforts to achieve increased diversity by hiring strategies and procedures.
- 2.3 Faculty teaching.
Summary of recognition, awards, indicators of successful teaching. Include policies and practices in place to encourage and recognize good teaching. Describe participation in General Education, Honors, and other university-wide programs.
- 2.4 Faculty scholarship.
Summary of faculty research, scholarship, or creative activity; individual productivity; sources and distribution of external and internal funding; quality measures, peer assessments. Provide narrative about the funding levels in your discipline necessary to keep a productive scholar functioning. Include policies and practices in place to create opportunities for scholarly growth.
- 2.5 Faculty service.
Summary of faculty involvement in university, professional, and community service. Include policies in place to recognize service. Provide narrative about how the program is impacted (positively and/or negatively) by its service components.
- 2.6 Retention, Promotion and Tenure.
Include a copy of the college or department RPT guidelines with date adopted. Provide a table showing all RPT cases considered since the last Graduate Council review with outcomes. Describe any faculty mentoring procedures you may have in place.
- 2.7 Faculty Vitae
Include separate short-form (4 page maximum) vitae for all faculty. Vitae should include education and summary of training, honors and awards, other academic achievements that indicate a faculty member's academic stature, courses taught, current research, and selected publications and/or artistic presentations. You may wish to limit the length of faculty vitae to include activities and publications in this review cycle (last seven years) plus particularly noteworthy achievements from previous years.

3. Students

3.1 Student recruitment

A statement on methods employed in recruiting, evaluating, and admitting both undergraduate and graduate students. What practices do you employ to retain students of particular merit in your undergraduate and graduate student body?

3.2 Student diversity

Address department efforts to recruit minority students and to achieve appropriate diversity among your student body.

3.3 Graduate admissions

Information indicating the quality of graduate students admitted to the program. A useful table would include undergraduate school, major, GPA, GRE or similar exam scores.

3.4 Student support

Methods of supporting and levels of support for graduate students (distinguish between Teaching Assistant, Research Assistant, Fellowships, Graduate Assistants). List scholarships and other financial support for undergraduates.

3.5 Student advising

Description of academic advising practices for undergraduate majors and minors and prospective graduate students in the program. Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of your academic advising. Include written policies for handling student appeals.

3.6 Teaching assistant (TA) training

Description of the program to prepare and train TAs in the art of effective teaching. Include TA orientation, on-going support and supervision, and TA evaluation. Describe additional measures, if any, taken to assist international TAs with communication skills.

4. Curriculum and programs of study

4.1 Degree and certificate requirements

List of all degrees, degree requirements, certificates, and program specialties in the program (may be copied from the current General Catalog if that list is up to date).

4.2 Courses offered

Listing of all the courses offered in the program (from the current General Catalog).

4.3 Programs of study

Give typical programs of study for (a) the Bachelor's degree, (b) the Master's degree, and (c) the Ph.D. degree. For the Bachelor's degree include typical course sequences for the various program specialties offered in the program, where possible by semester and year. For the Master's and Ph.D. degree programs, copies of representative candidacy and program of study forms could be used.

- 4.4 Professional development
Describe program efforts to provide training in professional development and professional ethics and standards.
- 4.5 Outreach education
Describe the unit's efforts to deliver education programs at sites remote from the central campus. What technologies are available to assist in your outreach programs? What is the relationship between outreach offerings and programs and the unit's overall instructional program, goals, and mission? What credits are accepted from outside providers; what is the contractual and oversight relationship to faculty, curriculum, and credit?
- 4.6 Qualifying Exams
Give the program policy for qualifying exams for master's and doctoral students. Provide copies of questions for the last five qualifying exams. How do students perform on your qualifying exams? Give numbers of passes, fails, and retakes. Student responses should be kept in the program as exhibits for possible examination.
- 4.7 Theses and dissertations
Tabulate all Master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations completed since the previous Graduate School review (normally the last seven years). Include the following: name of student, master's or doctorate, year of completion, name of principal faculty supervisor, title of thesis or dissertation. Also include abstracts of five recent dissertations and five recent theses.
5. Program effectiveness – Outcomes assessment
Each educational unit has an obligation to plan carefully its courses of instruction in response to student needs, to evaluate the effectiveness of that educational program in terms of the change it brings about in students, and to make improvements in the program dictated by the evaluative process.
- 5.1 Outcomes assessment procedures
List and describe the unit's processes for assessing its educational programs. The list may include, but is not restricted to, the use of outcomes measures in the following areas: (a) student information (recruitment, quality of students, retention, graduation rates, gender and ethnicity blend) and trends over time, (b) mid-program assessments, (c) end of program assessment (standard exam, capstone experience), (d) alumni satisfaction and loyalty, and (e) employment and/or employer satisfaction measures.
- 5.2 Outcomes assessment feedback
Provide specific examples of how the assessment activities have been used to improve teaching and learning in the unit. Of particular interest would be descriptions of the entire assessment feedback loop: identification and publication of expected learning outcomes, assessment measures, analysis, and interventions arising from the analysis that lead to an improvement in the program.

- 5.3 Degree completion data
Using the form on pg. 14, provide data indicating graduate degree completion/attrition data.
- 5.4 Employment
Provide statistical information and data, where available, on the present and projected job market for degree recipients and for further graduate or professional study.
6. Facilities and Resources
- 6.1 Operating budget issues
Assess the budget adequacy with respect to the program's mission.
- 6.2 Physical facilities
Describe the ways in which physical facilities in the unit encourage or limit the educational objectives of the program. In what ways do they fail to meet the unit's needs?
- 6.3 Libraries
Describe the program's general and special requirements for library resources in order to meet its educational and research objectives. Indicate ways in which the present library resources satisfy and do not satisfy these needs.
- 6.4 Centers, institutes or bureaus associated with the program.
List any centers that are associated with the academic program and explain briefly the relationships (funding, faculty appointments, student supervision, etc.) between the centers and the academic program.
- 6.5 Computers
Provide a general description of computing, word processing, networking, and e-mail facilities in the college or department/program. Give an outline of what facilities you would hope to have in place in five years' time.
- 6.6 Staff support.
Describe the existing staff support for your educational and research missions.

Example Table for reporting graduate degree completion/attrition data

Entering Student Cohort Academic Year	# of Entering Students w/ BA/BS	# of Students Entering with Masters	# who left before completing Masters	# who left after completing Masters	# who completed PhD	Average time to complete Masters*	Average time to complete PhD*	# Students Remaining in Program
1999-2000								
2000-2001								
2001-2002								
2002-2003								
2003-2004								
2004-2005								
2005-2006								
2006-2007								
2007-2008								
2008-2009								

* Average time computed from date of entry into program to date of completion of degree

Scheduling External and Internal Reviewer Site Visits

Coordination

The Graduate School coordinates travel arrangements for the site visits, which are usually about a day and a half long for external reviewers, with the visitors arriving the evening before the visit and departing the late afternoon or early evening of the second day of the site visit. The internal team visit is generally conducted in one day. It is the unit's responsibility to schedule the meetings described below, with the exception of the final exit meeting for external reviewers, which is scheduled by the Graduate School.

Visits with Students

Some of the most helpful meetings are those with students. Because students often bring up questions for which the site visitors will want to seek answers, these meetings should be set up fairly early in the schedule. Some units have found a brown bag lunch on the first day or a coffee/refreshment hour early on the second day to be good. Separate meetings with undergraduates and graduate students are desirable. After the visitors are introduced and their purpose explained, program faculty members should leave so that students feel free to discuss issues that either they or the site visitors bring up.

Visits with Faculty Members

Depending on the size of the faculty, two or three meetings might be desirable so that most faculty will have a chance to express their opinions. In addition to the general faculty meetings, there could be small meetings with the faculty who prepared the self-study, the graduate advisory committee, the undergraduate advisory committee, or other committees whose work relates to the program review. Individual faculty may also request time with the external reviewers. The head of the academic unit should not attend the meetings with faculty.

Visits with Departmental Staff

The external and internal review teams should have opportunities to meet with departmental staff.

Visits with Program Chair and College Dean

At least an hour should be scheduled for the site visitors to meet with the head of the academic unit. Because site visitors will usually have questions from their conversations with students and faculty, some time for this visit with administrators should be saved rather late in the schedule. The program also should schedule a meeting between the external reviewer and the dean of the supervising college.

Visits with Graduate School Dean, Associate Dean, and Members of Graduate Council

The site visits for external reviewers should end with an exit interview in the Graduate School. The exit interview will be attended by the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and by the Graduate Council ad hoc committee charged with writing the final summary report. Please note that an exit meeting is not held for internal review teams.

An Extra Note on Hospitality for Reviewers

Please ask a faculty member to serve as a local host who will pick up external reviewers at their hotel, escort them to their first meetings each day, arrange return transportation, and lend general assistance over the two days. Lavish entertaining of the site visitors is not expected or encouraged. Faculty members often go out to dinner with external reviewers; however, reviewers may also appreciate the opportunity to have dinner alone as a review team in order to discuss review business. The internal review teams generally require only lunch on the day of the site visit. The Graduate School will reimburse meal expenses for the reviewers only (contact the Graduate School for information about processing reimbursements). *If faculty members wish to go out to dinner or lunch with the visitors, the individuals or department are responsible for their own expenses.* The Graduate School cannot make reimbursement for alcoholic beverages.

Sample Itinerary for External Reviewers

Wednesday, November 1

Evening Reviewers arrive and take shuttle to University Park Marriott Hotel.

Thursday, November 2

7:15 a.m. Professor Brown meets review team at hotel coffee shop for breakfast and brings them to campus.
8:30 a.m. Meet with Professor Smith, Chair of the program, in room 321, Building XYZ.
9:30 a.m. Meet with the department executive committee in room 322, Building XYZ.
10:30 a.m. Meet with undergraduate students in room 323, Building XYZ. Student group organized by SAC chairperson J.W. Powell.
12:00 p.m. Lunch at the Crimson View Room, University Union, hosted by Professor Jones, and with Professors Green, White, and Black.
1:30 p.m. Meet with graduate students. Group organized by Ph.D. student P. King.
2:30 p.m. Meet with faculty group 1. Conference room, Building XYZ.
3:30 p.m. Meet with faculty group 2. Conference room, Building XYZ.
4:30 p.m. Tour of facilities. Professor Smith will conduct the tour. Professor Smith will escort review team back to hotel after the tour.
7:00 p.m. Dinner at Al Forno's. Professor Higgins will host. Also in attendance: Professors Miller, Gray, and Wright. After dinner, Professor Higgins will escort review team back to hotel.

Friday, November 3

7:15 a.m. Professors Smith (Chair) and Hutton (Assoc. Chair) meet review team at hotel coffee shop for breakfast and bring them to campus.
8:30 a.m. Meet with faculty group 3. Conference room, Building XYZ.
9:30 a.m. Meet with faculty group 4. Conference room, Building XYZ.
10:30 a.m. Time to review documents, exhibits, course materials, or to meet with individual faculty who have asked for private meetings.
11:30 a.m. Box lunch with director of Graduate Studies and Director of Undergraduate Studies.
1:00 p.m. Meet with College Dean, Professor Harrison, in room 456, Building MPH.
2:00 p.m. Exit interview with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council ad hoc committee in room 302 of the Park Building. Dean Harrison will arrange for someone to escort review team to the meeting.
3:15 p.m. Professor Marshall will pick up reviewers in the Park Building and drive them to the airport for their late afternoon flights.

Guidelines for External and Internal Reviewers

The task of the external reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of quality and effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate programs, and to determine where the program fits in the discipline regionally, nationally, or internationally. This evaluation is concerned primarily with the quality of education actually achieved by students and includes, but is not restricted to: overall quality and direction of the program; an assessment of the quality of faculty; students and the existence of policies and practices in support of them; curriculum offerings and program options; and the adequacy of staff support, physical facilities, library resources, equipment, and research facilities and of the program budget.

The internal committee has two major functions: (a) to provide judgment on program quality and governance from the viewpoint of colleagues at the University of Utah; and (b) to review the academic program of students and the quality of work accepted toward an undergraduate or graduate degree. Internal committees also are encouraged to focus their attention on questions concerning the relationships of programs to the goals of the total university.

The global request of both external and internal reviewers is to single out those features of the program that merit special commendation, and to make recommendations about situations where there is room for improvement. Put simply: "What is the program doing very well?" and, "What could the program do better?" Evaluations of these questions should be included in the sections of the reviewers' reports titled II Commendations and III Recommendations (see report format below).

Reviewers' investigations and subsequent reports should address issues pertinent to the following topics listed in the program self study:

1. Program Overview

- 1.1 Program mission and organization
- 1.2 Program planning
- 1.3 Previous Graduate Council review and actions
- 1.4 Department review sheet

Issues to be addressed include: the program's mission statement and organization and its suitability for the 2000's and beyond; the scale of the program in terms of the number and quality of the faculty, students, staff, facilities, and other resources; the extent of well-defined departmental policies supported by concrete goals and intermediate objectives and methods of assessing progress toward those goals and objectives; balance between teaching, research, and service; adequacy of salaries and fringe benefits to attract and retain outstanding faculty and staff; and program response to recommendations made in the previous Graduate Council review.

2. Faculty

- 2.1 Faculty profile
- 2.2 Faculty diversity
- 2.3 Faculty teaching
- 2.4 Faculty scholarship
- 2.5 Faculty service

2.6 Retention, promotion and tenure (RPT)

2.7 Faculty vitae

Issues to be addressed include: the numbers of faculty and diversity of faculty interest for the undergraduate and graduate programs offered; the gender and ethnic diversity of the faculty and departmental efforts to achieve appropriate diversity by hiring strategies and procedures; policies and efforts in the recruitment, retention, and promotion of minority and women faculty; the concern for, and performance in, teaching at all levels of the program; the general scholarly quality of the faculty compared with that of other leading colleges and universities in the country; publication records of faculty in monographs and refereed journals; record of external funding where appropriate; effectiveness of faculty performance evaluation, including tenured faculty review; suitability of RPT guidelines; faculty mentoring; faculty morale.

3. Students

3.1 Student recruitment

3.2 Student diversity

3.3 Graduate admissions

3.4 Student support

3.5 Student advising

3.6 Teaching assistant (TA) training

3.7 Employment

Issues to be addressed include: quality of undergraduate and graduate students; department efforts to recruit minority students and to achieve appropriate diversity among the student body; admission standards (too low? too demanding?); financial support for students; undergraduate and graduate student academic advising practices; appropriate training of teaching assistants; admissibility of graduating seniors into graduate programs of their choice; student input into the decision-making process in the program; completion rate of programs within normal time limits; opportunities for student-faculty exchange; student morale; and need for the program as indicated by (a) employers who hire graduates, (b) prospective students of high ability who apply for admission into the program, (c) knowledgeable persons who urge that well-prepared practitioners or researchers and new research findings and/or improved professional practice in the field are needed by society

4. Curriculum and programs of study

4.1 Degree and certificate requirements

4.2 Courses offered

4.3 Programs of study

4.4 Professional development

4.5 Outreach education

4.6 Qualifying Exams

4.7 Theses and dissertations

Issues to be addressed include: diversity of curriculum offerings to allow for a broad range of educational experiences and for specialization in the major sub-divisions of the discipline; program requirements (courses, graduation requirements, graduate qualifying examinations) compared with other leading universities in the country; instructional methods and innovations; training of teaching assistants; training in professional

development and ethics; guidelines for thesis and dissertation completion; supervisory committee guidelines and operation.

5. Program effectiveness - Outcomes assessment

- 5.1 Outcomes assessment procedures
- 5.2 Outcomes assessment feedback
- 5.3 Degree completion data

Issues to be addressed include: processes for assessing educational programs, including but not restricted to the use of outcomes measures in the following areas: (a) student information (recruitment, quality of students, retention, graduation rates, gender and ethnicity blend) and trends over time, (b) mid-program assessments, (c) end of program assessment (standard exam, capstone experience), (d) degree completion rates and time to degree, (e) alumni satisfaction and loyalty, and (f) employment and/or employer satisfaction measures. How have the department's assessment activities been used to improve teaching and learning in the unit? Of particular interest would be descriptions of the entire assessment feedback loop: identification and publication of expected learning outcomes, assessment measures, analysis, and interventions arising from the analysis that lead to an improvement in the program.

6. Facilities and Resources

- 6.1 Operating budget issues
- 6.2 Physical facilities
- 6.3 Libraries
- 6.4 Centers, institutes, and bureaus
- 6.5 Computers
- 6.6 Staff support

Issues to be addressed include: budget adequacy with respect to the program's mission; How appropriate are physical facilities (classrooms, office space, laboratories, study and lounge space), libraries, and computer facilities in terms of instructional, research, and service goals of the program? How do any centers, institutes, and bureaus associated with the program affect the academic and research goals and operation of the program? In what ways is staff support adequate or inadequate to support the educational mission of the program?

Report Format for External and Internal Reviews

The most useful reports for the Graduate Council, and for program and administrative heads, are those containing specific suggestions for improving the program. External reviewers should concentrate on remarks that relate the unit being reviewed to national norms and peer groups elsewhere. Internal reviewers should concentrate on the functioning of the program in comparison with practice within the University of Utah. It is particularly useful to receive descriptions of "good practice" external to, and within, the University of Utah that would alleviate problematic practices that are uncovered in the review process.

The length of reports is not prescribed; many reports received in the past vary in length between three and ten pages.

Part I: General

Part I should contain detailed observations, comments and discussion, organized into the five topics listed above:

- Program overview
- Faculty
- Students
- Curriculum and programs of study
- Program effectiveness - outcomes assessment
- Facilities and resources

As the Graduate Council ad-hoc committee charged with preparing a synthesis of the multiple reviewer reports will assemble most of the background information concerning the program from the self study document, reviewers need not write extensively in this section. But it is important to provide a context for understanding commendations and recommendations.

Part II: Commendations

Part II should enumerate commendations. What is the program doing very well? And in what areas has the program made significant recent progress that also deserves commendation?

Part III: Recommendations

Part III is reserved for recommendations that would improve any aspect of the program. These recommendations may be addressed to the program participants (students, faculty, staff), to program administrators, to the Graduate School, or to the University administration. Documentation on specific recommendations that are known to have been effective elsewhere are especially welcomed. Note: External and internal

reports are distributed widely among faculty and administration. As such, it is generally inappropriate to name specific individuals in a critical manner.