

PROCEDURES FOR QUALITATIVE REVIEWS OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

I. Mandate for Graduate Program Reviews

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

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

Where applicable, and at the discretion of the program, the Graduate School, and the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee (APCC), concurrent graduate and undergraduate program reviews will be conducted. However, separate Self-Study reports will be prepared by the program, and separate review reports will be prepared by the external reviewers.

Based on the recommendations resulting from a review of a graduate program, the program may be subject to a follow-up review two or five years later.

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

II. Review Cycle

A. Full-scale Reviews

1. New Graduate Programs:

A new graduate program will undergo a full-scale review, involving site visits by external reviewers, five years after its inception. The Self-Study for such a review will follow the format described in Appendix A, with two small differences: the Authorization to Implement document should be included as an appendix to the Self-Study; and in section I.A. of the Self-Study, where asked to address developments in the program since the previous GPRC review, the authors should instead address any differences between the current form of the program and that which was laid out in the program's Authorization to Implement document.

2. Continuing Graduate Programs:

Continuing graduate programs are subject to reviews using external reviewers every ten years after initial review. When circumstances warrant, full-scale reviews of continuing programs may be authorized by the GPRC at intervals of less than ten years. Special reviews may be initiated at the request of the program, the GPRC, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the appropriate college or school, or the Provost. Any special review will be formally authorized by vote of the GPRC. The Provost's office shall be informed of all special reviews by the Dean of the Graduate School.

3. Combined Graduate Program and Certificate Reviews:

Certificate programs are subject to review every 10 years. When circumstances warrant, graduate certificate reviews may be combined with full graduate program reviews or follow-up reviews of the home department.

Graduate programs which are professionally accredited may opt to synchronize the submission of the report with the re-accreditation report. Some re-accreditation cycles occur every 5 years; others are on a 7-year cycle. Programs may not regularly extend the time between UWM Graduate Program Reviews to align with accreditation cycles. For instance, a program cannot extend the time between graduate program reviews from 10 to 14 years in order to align with every other instance of a 7-year accreditation cycle.

III. Purpose of Reviews

Graduate Program Reviews have the Following Purposes:

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

IV. Role of Graduate Program Review Committee

The GPRC supervises a systematic and continuing review of existing graduate programs and makes recommendations about the continuance of graduate programs. The GPRC assures that reviews and subsequent responses are presented in a timely schedule for action.

V. Internal Review Team (IRT)

A. Selection/Membership

An Internal Review Team (IRT) is appointed by the Chair of the GPRC and is composed of two members of the GPRC.

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

B. Responsibilities

The IRT is responsible for:

- 1. Being fully acquainted with the Program Self-Study, the report submitted by the external reviewers, and the program response to the report.
- 2. Meeting with the external reviewers at the beginning of the site visit, attending as many meetings as schedules permit, and participating in the exit interview, when possible.
- 3. Presenting the report of the external reviewers to the GPRC, identifying any

inconsistencies or inaccuracies therein, advising the GPRC concerning the merits of the program response to the report, and, when necessary, reconciling the external reviewers' report and the program's response. The IRT may also make recommendations for modifications to the report.

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

VI. External Reviewers

A. Selection

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

B. Responsibilities

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

VII. Site Visit Procedures

A. Information Base

At least two weeks before the site visit, the Graduate School will distribute an electronic copy of the Graduate Program Self-Study to members of the IRT, the Provost, the Dean and Academic Associate Dean of the program being reviewed, and the external reviewers.

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

B. Agenda

The site visit agenda is developed by the program being reviewed in consultation with the Graduate School.

The agenda should include meetings between the external reviewers and the following persons and groups: the Provost and/or Vice Provost in charge of communicating program reviews to the UW System, the Dean and/or Associate Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean and/or Associate Dean of the appropriate college or school with responsibility for the program budget, Graduate Program Director, Department Chair (for programs hosted in departments), tenured program faculty, untenured program faculty, students, and recent graduates.

The IRT members attend as many of these meetings as possible.

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

The agenda concludes with an exit interview among the external reviewers, the IRT, the Dean of the Graduate School, the chair and graduate program representative of the program being reviewed. Invitations may be extended to the Provost's Office, and the

Dean and Academic Associate Dean of the appropriate School or College.

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

A. Report

The external reviewers jointly prepare a report to be submitted to the Dean and the Graduate School within six weeks of the site visit.

An executive summary will be written jointly by the external reviewers (approximately 1/2 page, single spaced) that includes a letter grade rating (selected from the following five categories).

A: Continuance without Conditions: This program meets or exceeds the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards. The program will continue operations taking into account recommendations from reviewers. The next full review will be scheduled in ten years.

B: Continuance with Considerations: This program meets the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards but with minor concerns. The program's response will address the reviewer's concerns and recommendations per the guidelines in IX. Section A. The next full review would be scheduled in ten years.

C: Continuance with Show Cause: This program does not meet the external reviewers' expectations of quality standards at this time. The program has one year to submit an action plan to the Unit Dean showing cause for continuing as described in Section X. The next review will be scheduled in five years unless the Unit Dean certifies progress. If progress is unacceptable, program will be moved to Provisional Status.

D: Provisional Status: Due to critical issues identified during the review process, the program is asked to suspend admissions for 1 - 2 years. During this period, the program will be the subject of an extended internal review involving senior administrators (selected by Provost and Dean of Grad School). To reinstate admission the program needs to show credible progress in rectification of critical issues. Two-year and five-year internal reviews will be conducted.

E: Discontinuance: The program should be discontinued.

In the case of a concurrent graduate/undergraduate review, the external reviewers will prepare a separate report.

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

B. Model Format

Conclusions

The external reviewers' report should provide general conclusions about the state of the graduate program: the need for the program, the number and quality

of the faculty and their productivity, the number and quality of its students relative to its capacity, the appropriateness of the curriculum, the quality of program assessment practices, and so forth.

Recommendations

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

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

Analysis

Where appropriate, the external reviewers may wish to organize this section according to the rubrics of the program Self-Study:

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

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

C. Distribution

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

IX. Preparation of Final Review Report

A. Program Response

The Department Chair and Graduate Program Representative are charged with sharing the external reviewers' report with the graduate program faculty.

Within six weeks of receiving the report, the graduate program will submit a response to the Graduate School.

The purpose of this response is to correct errors of fact in the external reviewers' report and to make any necessary clarifications.

The Graduate School will then forward the external reviewers' report and the

program's response to the IRT.

Though the program may wish to initiate discussion of the conclusions and recommendations of the report, a detailed and specific status report in response to the charges of the review is not expected until the next program review.

B. GPRC Actions

The IRT presents the external reviewers report at a meeting of the GPRC. The school/college dean or their designee and representatives of the graduate program will be invited to this meeting. Based on the IRT's observations and the program's response, the GPRC may amend the report. The GPRC will clearly document changes made to the report submitted by the external reviewers and the justification for such changes. The GPRC also will append the program response if so requested.

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

C. GFC Actions in Case of a D or E Rating

If an Executive Summary recommends Provisional Status or Discontinuance GPRC will refer the report and its recommendations to the GFC for full discussion.

The Graduate Faculty Committee (GFC) will consider the report and recommendations of the GPRC and refer its recommendations on the graduate program(s) to the Dean of the Graduate School.

The Dean then transmits the document to the Provost (with copies to unit dean, chair, grad director, GFC and GPRC chairs), which will be based on the site visit, executive summary and recommendations, GPRC report and GFC approval.

X. Subsequent Utilization of the External Report

Develop action plan and assess implementation.

- A. Dean of individual unit meets department chair and graduate program director, and other key personnel at discretion of program; they prepare proposed action plan.
- B. Provost discusses newly reviewed programs and their action plans in their annual evaluations of individual Deans and their school/college performance. The Provost approves the final action and resource plan for each review.
- C. The Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School meet annually with the Provost to understand patterns in reviewer recommendations for all newly reviewed programs and discuss program/school/college action plans including resources.

XI. Accreditation Reviews

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

GFC Doc. 951–Appendix A
Format for Graduate Program Self-Study

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

In completing the Self-Study, programs are encouraged to conduct a thorough and participatory examination of the current and future status of the program. The Self-Study is intended to provide an opportunity for the program faculty to look at all facets of program operation and outcomes and engage in critical self-examination as well as formulate curricular, programmatic and research goals and objectives, benchmarks, and milestones for the next 10 years.

The GPRC encourages programs to be forthright in identifying and addressing weaknesses in the program. In addition, the Self-Study and accompanying supplementary documentation form the foundation of information supplied to the external reviewers.

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

NOTE:

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

Table of Contents

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

Executive Summary

In an executive summary prefatory to the report, present an overview of the program, with special attention to issues the program faces and concerns for the future.

The executive summary should include statements about the program's position in relation to its mission and objectives, the school/college mission, and the university mission. It should provide the number of faculty (including clinical and adjunct faculty) currently contributing to the program and a general statement about the research or creative activity of the faculty. The summary should include an overview of the current student body, and their numbers and distribution within the program (e.g., by concentration, stages of the program: coursework, thesis, preliminary examination, dissertation).

The executive summary should also succinctly describe goals and objectives for the next 10 years in two segments:

(1) Short-term goals and objectives for years 1-5 post-review; and (2) longer-term goals and objectives, for years 6-10 post-review. Each segment should be accompanied by a listing of benchmarks and milestones. For programs ranked nationally or regionally, this section should report the most current ranking, or other relevant citations or ratings/benchmarks, and where it expects to be in rank in 10 years.

Contact Persons

After the executive summary, list the names of the Dean (and where appropriate, Associate Dean) of the school or college that houses the program, the name or names of the preparers of the Self-Study report, and faculty and staff contact people with telephone numbers and e-mail addresses.

I. The Program

A. Description and Evaluation

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

Describe the current graduate program(s) with particular attention to its unique qualities, special features, and strengths. For programs that have been reviewed previously, comment on developments in the program since the last GPRC review, and the implementation of recommendations from previous reviews more broadly. If this is the first review of the program, comment on developments since the program's inception, and address how the form of the program compares to what was laid out in the program's Authorization to Implement document.

Comment on the programmatic and curricular improvements and enhancements being planned for the next 10 years, and explain the rationale for the refinements.

Where appropriate, comment on related programs at UWM (including undergraduate and other graduate degree and certificate programs in your academic unit). Address issues of articulation, duplication, or collaboration with other programs, as those categories represent either problems or opportunities.

If they are relevant, discuss similar programs at other institutions in Wisconsin and elsewhere, in terms of competition or collaboration with those programs.

Discuss the current and future projected demands for the program, including trends in the number and quality of applicants and the placement success of its recent graduates.

Detail new trends in the field and the program's position/response to those developments. (Please refer to any surveys of data available on trends and projections.)

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

Identify any obstacles to achieving the program's objectives which have arisen in recent years. What steps have been contemplated or taken to deal with these problems?

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

If the program is currently accredited, summarize the findings of any accreditation reports that may have been conducted during the review period. What was the program's response to the accreditation report? How is the program positioning itself with respect to the next accreditation review?

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

B. Administrative Structure

Describe the administrative and governance structure of the program. How does the structure promote the achievement of the program's objectives? What changes, if any, need to be made in preparation for the next 10 years of refinements and upgrades?

Discuss any problems of organization or management within the program and how these are going to be addressed.

Discuss the nature and quality of interactions with its department(s), school or college (including school or college Graduate Program Committee), with governance bodies, and with the Graduate Academic Programs and Student Services area of the Graduate School. What changes are necessary, if any, to facilitate the program's development over the next 10 years?

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

II. Faculty

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

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

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

Where appropriate, discuss the role of adjunct and other non-faculty personnel in the instructional program. What procedures are in place to assure the quality of instruction provided by instructors who are not members of the program graduate faculty?

III. Students

Assess the number and quality of applicants to the program. What trends in application patterns have been discerned?

Describe the criteria and procedures used to review and select applicants for admission. What measures can be taken to improve the caliber of students recruited and enrolled; to significantly increase rates of retention and graduation; and to realize timely progress to degree?

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

Insert Applications, Admissions, New Enrollment Table (supplied by the Graduate School).

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

Estimate optimum enrollment in your program(s) and estimate/compare with the status of the current student body: what percentage are taking coursework, completing a master's capstone experience, at PhD preliminary exam stage, doctoral dissertators?

Estimate the completion rate for students in your program(s).

Discuss any perceived problems with retention/completion and describe any steps the faculty has taken to correct these problems.

Insert Total Official Enrollment Table (supplied by the Graduate School).

Describe the advising system within the program and other ways by which expectations and opportunities are conveyed to students.

Explain the program's strategies for mentoring graduate students and socializing them as apprentice scholars or professional practitioners. How is student progress toward the degree monitored by the program faculty?

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

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

What is the participation of students in the governance of the program? Comment on the special achievements of students and graduates of the program.

Discuss the support of graduate students through departmental and university fellowships and assistantships.

Describe any problems associated with graduate assistantships. How are graduate assistants trained and supervised?

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

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

IV. Curriculum

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

Detail curricular modifications enacted during the review period and/or future changes currently under consideration. Explain the reasons for these changes. What measures are in place to ensure that curricula in the program reflect the state of the art/science in the program of study?

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

How are issues related to diversity reflected in the curriculum?

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

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

years. See example table below.

Graduates by concentration in the [degree program name]

Name of concentration	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Name of concentration	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21

If applicable, for each area of specialization or concentration, list the courses for which graduate students may receive credit.

V. Outcomes and Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

Example: Outcome Data for Master’s Graduates AY 2012-2021

Field	Academic Year ending August 20xx									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Further grad study (omit this row for doctoral programs)										
<i>Employed in</i>										
Higher Education										
Primary/Secondary Education										
Government										
Industry										
Professional										
Self-employed										
Postdoctoral training										
Other (explain in footnote)										

Briefly indicate how and when this information was collected.

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

VI. Research/Scholarship Environment and Productivity

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

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

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

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

VII. Resources

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

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

If applicable, insert External Funding and/or Internal Research Awards Tables (supplied

by the Graduate School).

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

Detail any concerns about equipment and instruments.

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

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

VIII. Appendices

- A. For continuing graduate programs, GPRC documents from the most recent full and follow-up reviews (supplied by the Graduate School). For new graduate programs, the Authorization to Implement document.
- B. Current Graduate School Bulletin copy for the program(s). This includes a description of current program requirements and courses (Information may be copied from the curriculum management system).
- C. Degree Completion Detail
 - 1. For master's programs with multiple capstone options, provide numbers of students who graduated under each option (e.g. thesis, project, comprehensive examination) for each academic year of the review period. See example table below.

Graduates by capstone option in the [degree program name]

Capstone Option	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Thesis					
Comprehensive Examination					
Project					

Capstone Option	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Thesis					
Comprehensive Examination					
Project					

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

See sample format below:

Master's Degree Recipients: Thesis or Project Option, Academic Year 16-17

Student Name:

Advisor:

Thesis Title or Project Description:

Resulting Publications:

Post-graduate employment (position title, employer):

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

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

See sample format below:

Doctoral Degree Recipients Academic Year 16-17

Student Name:

Advisor:

Dissertation Title:

Resulting Publications:

Post-graduate employment (position title, employer):

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

(This information can be copied from the curriculum management system.)

- E. Library report (supplied by the Golda Meir Library which will be requested on your behalf by the Graduate School)

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

IX. Supplementary Documentation

The following materials should be supplied under separate cover:

- A. Electronic copies of written materials that describe program policies, procedures, or requirements such as student handbooks or program brochures.
- B. Electronic copies of updated vitae of all faculty members involved in the graduate program(s) being reviewed.

GFC Document 951–Appendix B

Summary of Data Tables Supplied by the Graduate School

Applications, Admissions and New Enrollment Table

- Applied, Admitted, Refused, New Enrolled (By spring, fall, summer, winterim semesters)

Incoming G.P.A and Test Scores Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall:

- Average incoming GPA for incoming students
- Average GRE scores by section (Verbal, Quantitative, Analytical Writing) for Applicants, Admits, Newly Enrolled, and Refused
- Average overall IELTS and TOEFL test scores for Applicants, Admits, Newly Enrolled, and Refused

Total Official Enrollment Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall (All by spring, fall, summer semesters; all broken down by Continuing, Total Enrollment, Re-Entry)

- Overall total enrollment
- Total enrollment by gender
- Total enrollment by race and ethnicity
- Total enrollment by residency, including international status

Student Financial Assistance Table

- TA/RA/PA FTE and headcount of students in the program employed as assistants (by spring, fall, summer semesters)
- Fellowships: DDF, DGSF, AOP. (By AY)
- NOTE: Programs seeking data on scholarships or loans should inquire with Financial Aid

Degrees Awarded Table (All by AY)

- Degrees awarded by gender
- Degrees awarded by race and ethnicity
- Degrees awarded by residency
- Degrees awarded by domestic vs international

External Funding Table

Include for program and Graduate School overall:

- Grant Proposals/Research Award \$/Instructional Award \$ (By AY)

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

Include for program and Graduate School overall:

- By AY (Number of awards and \$)

GFC Document 951–Appendix C

The Internal Review Team (IRT) Report to the Graduate Program Review Committee (GPRC)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Internal Review Team (IRT) is responsible for:

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

II. THE PRESENTATIONS

1. Sources of Information

- Graduate Program Self-Study Document
- Two-Day Site Visit
- External reviewers' Report
- Department/Program's response to the external reviewers' report

NOTE:

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

2. Preparing the written report for presentation to GPRC

- The report should provide sufficient general information about the program and the programmatic context within which the external reviewers' recommendations are made.
- In addition, the report should provide a critical review of the recommendations made by the external reviewers. The IRT report should rank order/prioritize the recommendations, and provide the rationale for the way they have rank ordered the recommendations.
- The IRT report should also identify any inaccuracies, clarify contradictions, and suggest revisions to the external reviewers' report, if any, and discuss the merits of the evaluation.
- Program representatives may take issue with evaluations of the program or interpretations of evidence in the external reviewers' report and offer alternative evaluations or interpretations. Further, program representatives may object to specific wording of conclusions or recommendations because they believe that the wording gives inappropriate emphasis to an issue or that the wording is likely to cause misinterpretation by other readers. The IRT should take note of any and all concerns, but should not feel obligated to make any suggestions on behalf of the program.

If program representatives indicate substantial conflicts in evaluation or interpretation in their written response to the external reviewers' report, the IRT may wish to offer an independent assessment of both views, and take special care in providing a full rationale for the items in contention.

For example, the IRT may candidly note that the program objects to a conclusion or recommendation and offer reasons for the IRT rejecting the program's view.

3. Importance of Internal Review Team (IRT) Members

Graduate programs are reviewed only once every 10 years except for new programs, which are reviewed every 5 years for the first 10 years.

These reviews are an important tool for maintaining the quality and integrity of graduate programs.

Program faculty, the Graduate School and GPRC invest considerable time and resources in these reviews. This investment is justified only if the review report is of sufficient quality to serve as a guideline for improving graduate programs.

IRT members play a critical in assuring that the review process serves this important function. The Golden Rule applies here: invest the same effort and care in preparing the IRT report that you would want when your program is under review.