

University of Oklahoma
Health Sciences Center
Graduate College Program Review

Description
and
Procedures

The Graduate College
1000 Stanton L. Young Blvd.
Library, Room 258
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	5
Purpose	5
Elements of an effective program review	6
Participants in program reviews and their responsibilities	7
Steps in the Graduate College program review	9
Nominating potential reviewers	11
External reviewers	11
Internal reviewers	11
Format for listing potential reviewers	11
Program self-study	12
Scheduling external and internal reviewer site visits	17
Sample itinerary for external reviewer	19
Guidelines for external and internal reviewers	21
Report Format for External and Internal Reviews.....	24
Acknowledgements	26

Introduction

In accordance with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Policy, all graduate degree-granting programs at the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center are subject to regular review. Reviews for graduate programs are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council and are administered by the Dean of the Graduate College.

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 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 Oklahoma 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 Colleges, 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. Programs undergoing reviews are evaluated using academic criteria.
5. To the extent possible, program review is an objective process. It asks programs to engage in self-studies and assess themselves as objectively as possible. 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 program 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 OUHSC Graduate College 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 Oklahoma Health Sciences Center; and (b) external consultants who are professors of national reputation in the discipline under review.

Internal committee members are appointed by the Graduate College 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 programs from the viewpoint of colleagues at the University of Oklahoma; 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 a graduate degree. Internal committees are encouraged to focus their attention on questions that require considerable familiarity with programs and their relationship to other programs 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 College but are selected in part based on names suggested by the program under review. Two to three external reviewers are selected to review a graduate program. While every effort is made for the external reviewers to perform their duties without a site visit, if necessary external reviewers may visit the Health Sciences Center for the review. The task of the external reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of quality and effectiveness of 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 program 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 external reviewers and the internal review committee, packets of documentary material (the program self-study) are prepared by the program under review and made available through the Graduate College 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, degree requirements, and placement of students, (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.

Written reports 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 Dean of the Graduate College. The dean then transmits copies of the reports to the program director/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 program director/chairman is expected to share all reports with all members of the regular faculty.

All documents are then submitted to the Graduate College Dean who is charged with synthesizing the reports and producing a summary report for the program review. The Dean meets with external consultants by phone or when they are on campus and with the internal committee when it submits its report. The Dean may, but is not required to, meet with the college dean or the program director to clarify issues raised in the various reports. The Dean will submit the report with commendations, suggestions, 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 Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Provost and Senior Vice President for OUHSC. The Provost and Vice Provost, who have not been directly involved in the program review until this stage, then meet with the program director/chair, college dean, and dean of the graduate college, 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 Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education by the Provost.

Staff support and expenses for preparing the program self-study are borne by individual programs or units. The Graduate College provides honoraria for reviewers and is responsible for all travel expenses, housing, and related expenses for external reviewers invited to the campus.

Steps in the Graduate College Program Review and Approximate Timelines

1. A program is notified of a scheduled Graduate College 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 College.
2. The Dean of the Graduate College and staff meets with the program director/chair and or graduate director to review procedures and set timelines for the review.
3. The program will:
 - (a) supply the Graduate College with names of potential external reviewers,
 - (b) supply the Graduate College with names of potential internal reviewers.
 - (c) prepare a self-study (see later section for format and description),

Lists of reviewers should be supplied to the Graduate College within 2 months of the meeting with the Graduate Dean; the self-study should be completed within 5 months of the meeting with the Graduate Dean.

4. The Graduate College contacts and appoints external reviewers and internal reviewers. The Graduate College informs the program director/chair and the college dean of the names of the respective review teams within 3 months of the meeting with the Graduate Dean.
5. The program, in coordination with the Graduate College, arranges detailed itineraries for external and internal reviewers. Visits of external visitors, if a site visit is required, should end with an exit interview with the Dean of the Graduate College. External reviewers are requested to submit their reports within two months of receiving the departmental self-study or 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 of the Graduate College. Internal reviewers are requested to submit their reports within two months of receiving the departmental self-study.
7. The Graduate College receives written reports from the external and internal reviewers. The reviewers' reports are sent to the program director/chair and college dean for a written response from the program. A period of one month is provided for replies.
8. The reports and the program's response are given to the Graduate Dean who is responsible for writing the Summary Report. Generally, one month is provided to write the Summary Report.
9. All Graduate Council members are given the program review Summary Report together with all supporting documents. The Graduate Council discusses, amends, and approves the Summary Report.

10. The Graduate College Summary Report is distributed to the program director/chair and to the college dean for correction of factual information. The program is requested to inform the Graduate College of significant actions taken since the inception of the review and not contained in other supporting documents.
11. Wrap-up meeting. The Graduate College Summary Report and supporting materials are submitted to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for review. The program director/chair, college dean, and Dean of the Graduate College will then meet with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences to discuss the Summary Report and program review recommendations. A Memorandum of Understanding will be developed and for each recommendation that is deemed achievable within the resources of the institution, written responsibilities and timelines will be established for implementing the recommendation.
12. The Graduate College Dean is available to attend a program faculty meeting to discuss the review process in general and the Memorandum of Understanding and recommendations in particular.
13. The Graduate College Summary Report and the Memorandum of Understanding will then be sent to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences for forwarding to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Nominating Potential Reviewers

External Reviewers

The program should supply the Graduate College 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. They should not have academic ties to OUHSC and should not be collaborators with faculty members of the program under review. The program should consider gender, ethnic, and age diversity when suggesting potential reviewers. Note that the Graduate College, not the program, contacts reviewers. The Graduate College also may select reviewers not on the program's 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 program, specify the person's principal area of scholarly activity in terms of the areas represented by the program being reviewed (e.g., glycobiology, protein-energy, or malnutrition epidemiology of diabetes). The nominee should be familiar with the degree being offered by the program.

Internal Reviewers

The program should supply the Graduate College with a list of five potential internal reviewers. So as to avoid conflict of interest, internal reviewers should not be based in the same program as the program being reviewed and at least one from outside the college of the program being reviewed. Please consider gender, ethnic, and age diversity when suggesting names. The Graduate College may also select reviewers not on the program list.

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

Format for Listing Potential Reviewers

To aid the Graduate College in contacting potential reviewers, please supply the following information for each of the suggested external and internal reviewers.

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?

What are the future plans and goals?

Eight copies of the program self-study must be provided to the Graduate College. One copy is sent by the Graduate College to each of the three external reviewers and each of the three internal reviewers. Two copies are retained in the Graduate College. 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 College review (normally seven years). A large amount of this material can be organized into a tabular format and programs are encouraged to do so wherever possible.

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 and 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 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

Provide summaries of previous program reviews; include accreditation report if it refers to graduate programs. Provide narrative on actions taken since the review.

1.4 Program review sheet

Include Program Review Sheet with information on graduate student enrollment, majors (tracks, specializations, emphasis, etc), degrees granted, faculty headcount, and salary averages by rank. This information should be provided at the departments request by the Office of Institutional Research. Provide narrative interpretation of the review sheet where appropriate. More information may be added as deemed necessary by the program.

2. Graduate Faculty

2.1 Faculty profile

Summary of faculty profile providing information on the number of faculty (tenure/non-tenure rank; graduate faculty status and 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. Address separately, the diversity of your faculty (gender, ethnicity) and departmental efforts to achieve appropriate diversity by hiring strategies and procedures. Include changes in numbers or faculty levels over the last 5 years.

2.2 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 Undergraduate, Professional, and Graduate Education, and other university-wide programs. Include changes in loads over the last 5 years.

2.3 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 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 College review with outcomes. Describe any faculty mentoring procedures you may have in place.

2.6 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 titles that indicate a faculty member's academic stature, courses taught, current research, and selected publications. 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 graduate students. What practices do you employ to recruit students of particular merit in your graduate student body? Address separately department efforts to recruit minority students and to achieve appropriate diversity among your student body.

3.2 Graduate admissions

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

3.3 Student support

Methods of supporting and levels of support for graduate students. Identify sources and level of support for graduate students (mentors grant, student fellowship, training grant, departmental/university funds).

3.4 Student advising

Provide a general description of the organizational structure of your graduate program and an organizational chart, i.e. liaison, graduate program committee, advisory committee, examination committee, thesis/dissertation committee.

Assess the functioning of this organizational structure. How is committee composition determined? Are all graduate faculty included and given the opportunity to participate? How does the program determine whether the committee's composition has the appropriate scientific and educational expertise needed for the student?

Assess the graduation rate and time to degree. Provide a timeline of a typical student in your program and when they are expected to achieve specific milestones.

3.6 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.

4. Curriculum and programs of study

4.1 Degree requirements

List all degrees, certificates, and specializations offered and provide requirements for each.

4.2 Programs of study

Give typical programs of study for the Master's degree, and the Ph.D. degree. Copies of representative candidacy and program of study forms could be used.

4.3 Courses offered

Listing of all the courses offered in the program (from the current OUHSC Course Catalog). Have any of these courses not been offered in the last two years? Why?

4.4 Outreach education

Describe the unit's efforts to deliver education programs at sites remote from the OKC 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?

4.5 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.

4.6 Theses and dissertations

Tabulate all Master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations completed since the previous Graduate College 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. Provide a listing of publications related to research by student. 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.

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.

Scheduling External and Internal Reviewer Site Visits

Coordination

When a site visit is deemed necessary, the Graduate College in cooperation with the program coordinates the visits, usually two days long for external reviewers, with the visitors arriving the evening before the two-day visit and leaving in the evening or late afternoon of the second day. The internal team visits are generally distributed over segments of 2-3 days. If you have questions, call a staff member at the Graduate College at 271-2085. The meetings will be arranged within the Graduate College, but it will be the unit's responsibility to arrange tours of its facilities and to schedule the appropriate meetings as described below.

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. 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. If external evaluators are not on-site telephone and/or video conference meetings may be arranged with the students.

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 should probably be a small meeting with the faculty who prepared the self-study, the graduate advisory committee, or other committees whose work relates to the program review. Individual faculty may also request time with the reviewers. The head of the academic unit should not attend the meetings with faculty. If external evaluators are not on-site telephone and/or video conference meetings may be arranged with the faculty.

Visits with Program Director/Chair and College Dean

At least an hour should be scheduled for the review teams 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 should schedule a meeting between the external reviewer and the dean of the supervising college. If external evaluators are not on-site telephone and/or video conference meetings may be arranged with the Program Director/Chair and College Dean.

Visits with Graduate College Dean

The site visits for external reviewers should end with an exit interview in the Graduate College. A similar exit interview for the internal team is held at the time of the completion of the internal review report. If external evaluators are not on-site a telephone and/or video conference meeting may be arranged with the Graduate College Dean.

An Extra Note on Hospitality for On-site External Reviewers

Please ask a faculty member to serve as a local host who will pick up visitors at their hotel, escort them to their first meetings each day, arrange return transportation, and lend general assistance over the two days. Sometimes it is useful for your own faculty members to have the extra time with the visitors. Although local hotels provide shuttle service to the airport, it may be better for someone in the unit to give the visitor a ride. Lavish entertaining of the site visitors is not expected or encouraged. They will have a busy two days on campus and will probably appreciate a few hours of peace and quiet. Also, no funds have been set aside for entertainment. If faculty members wish to go out to dinner or lunch with the visitors, the individuals or department are responsible for these expenses. Visitors will be reimbursed for any expenses related to their visit with proof of proper receipts.

Sample Itinerary for an On-site External Reviewer

Monday, November 1

- 8:35 p.m. Reviewer Dr. Doe arrives from Seattle on Delta Flight 123. She catches complimentary shuttle to her hotel if convenient or, if not, takes taxi.
Or
Professor Brown meets Dr. Doe at the airport and takes her to her hotel.

Tuesday, November 2

- 7:00 a.m. Professor Brown meets Dr. Doe at the hotel for breakfast and brings Dr. Doe to campus.
- 8:30 a.m. Meet with Professor Smith, Program Director/Chair of the program, in room 321, Building XYZ.
- 9:30 a.m. Meet with the program executive committee in room 322, Building XYZ.
- 10:30 a.m. Meet with graduate students. Group organized by Ph.D. student P. King.
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch at the Panorama Room, University Union hosted by Professor Jones, and with Professors Green, White, and Black.
- 1:30 p.m. Meet with faculty group 1. Conference room, Building XYZ.
- 2:30 p.m. Meet with faculty group 2. Conference room, Building XYZ.
- 3:30 p.m. Tour of facilities. Professor Smith will conduct the tour. Professor Smith will escort Dr. Doe back to the University Park Hotel after the tour.
- 6:00 p.m. Dinner. Professor Higgins will host. Also in attendance: Professors Miller, Gray, and Wright. After dinner, Professor Higgins will escort Dr. Doe back to the hotel.

Wednesday, November 3

- 7:00 a.m. Professors Smith (Chair) and Hutton (Assoc. Chair) meet Dr. Doe at the hotel for breakfast and bring Dr. Doe 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, and to meet with individual faculty members who have asked for private meetings. Approximately 20 minute blocks of time per faculty member.

- 12:00 p.m. Lunch with director of Graduate Studies/Liaison.
- 1:30 p.m. Meet with College Dean, Professor Harrison, in room 456, Building MPH.
- 2:30 p.m. Dean Harrison will provide a room for Dr. Doe to arrange her thoughts before meeting with the Dean of the Graduate College.
- 3:00 p.m. Exit interview with the Dean of the Graduate College. Dean Harrison will arrange for someone to take Dr. Doe to the meeting.
- 4:30 p.m. Professor Marshall will pick Dr. Doe up at the Park Building and take her to the airport for her 6:00 p.m. flight.

Guidelines for External and Internal Reviewers

The task of the external reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of quality and effectiveness of 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 OUHSC; and (b) to review the academic program of students and the quality of work accepted toward a 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, III Suggestions, and IV 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 College review and actions
 - 1.4 Statistical summary

Issues to be addressed include: the program's mission statement and organization and its suitability for today 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 College review.

2. Faculty
 - 2.1 Faculty profile/diversity
 - 2.2 Faculty teaching
 - 2.3 Faculty scholarship
 - 2.4 Faculty service
 - 2.5 Retention, promotion and tenure (RPT)
 - 2.6 Faculty vitae

Issues to be addressed include: the numbers of faculty and diversity of faculty interest for the graduate programs offered (address separately 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/diversity
- 3.2 Graduate admissions
- 3.3 Student support
- 3.4 Student advising
- 3.6 Employment

Issues to be addressed include: quality of graduate students (address separately 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; graduate student academic advising practices; 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 Qualifying Exams
- 4.5 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; 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

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) alumni satisfaction and loyalty, and (e) employment and/or employer satisfaction measures. How have the program'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 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 Health Sciences Center. It is particularly useful to receive descriptions of "best practices" external to, and within, the Health Sciences Center 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 below:

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

The Graduate College Dean charged with preparing the 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: Suggestions

Part III is reserved for suggestions that would improve any aspect of the program. These suggestions may be addressed to the program participants (students, faculty, staff), to program administrators, to the Graduate College, or to the University administration. Documentation on specific suggestions that are known to have been effective elsewhere is 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.

Part IV. Recommendations

Part IV is reserved for recommendations that the committee feels is essential for the program to address. These are items which impair or disrupt the program to such an extent that the program will not be able to improve without addressing them. This section may also include areas where the program differs so greatly from the industry standard that it is hindering its overall growth and improvement. If the committee does make recommendations it should give ideas on how to

correct them. The committee does not need to identify any recommendations. 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.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Dr. David S. Chapman and the University of Utah's Graduate School for their willingness to share their descriptions and procedures document for Graduate Council Program Reviews. This document was frequently used when preparing our guidelines.

