TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Graduate School

Graduate Program Review Guidelines

Staff Involved in Program Review

Phone: (806) 742-2781   Fax: (806) 742-1746

Marlene Kenady
Unit Coordinator   x834.5265
email: marlene.kenady@ttu.edu

Clifford Fedler
Associate Dean of the Graduate School   x834.3964
email: clifford.fedler@ttu.edu

Dominick Casadonte
Interim Dean of the Graduate School   x834.3850
email: dominick.casadonte@ttu.edu

****

Introduction

The main objective of periodic 6-year program reviews is to provide a mechanism for maintaining and improving the quality of graduate programs at Texas Tech University. Periodic program reviews give administrators and academic leaders important information about the size and quality of a program, the program's future resource needs, recruitment, strengths and weaknesses, and its contribution to the strategic plan of the university. The outcome of program reviews are used to give direction, to set goals for the future, and to ensure that general academic plans and budget decisions are based on solid information and priorities, which match closely to those of the university. Periodic program reviews also provide a mechanism for faculty to evaluate the effectiveness, progress and status of their program.

Schedule of Graduate Academic Program Reviews

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2013-2014

Agricultural and Applied Economics

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Agricultural and Applied Economics	MS	PhD	1010300	
Agribusiness	MAA		1010100	

Chemical Engineering

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Chemical Engineering	MS CHE	PhD	14070100	

Economics

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Economics	MS	PhD	45060100	

Landscape Architecture

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Landscape Architecture	MLA		4060100	

Physics

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Physics	MS	PhD	40080100	
Applied Physics	MS		40080101	

Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Anthropology	MA		45020100	
Sociology	MA		45110100	

Visual and Performing Arts – Music

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Music Education	MME		13131200	
Music	MM	DMA	50090100	
Fine Arts-Music		PhD	50010100	

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2014-2015

Community, Family, and Addiction Studies (formerly APS, ch'd 11/2012))

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Family & Consumer Sciences Education	MS	PhD	13130800	
Marriage & Family Therapy	MS	PhD	51150500	
Addictions and the Family			45010100	CERT

Personal Financial Planning (new dept as of 11/2012 – was in APS)

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Personal Financial Planning	MS		19040100	CERT
Personal Financial Planning		PhD	52080400	

(2014-2015 cont'd next page)

(2014-2015 continued)

Architecture

Architecture	March/MS		4020100	
Land Use Planning, Management & Design		PhD	3020600	
Historic Preservation				CERT

Chemistry and Biochemistry

Chemistry	MS	PhD	40050100	

Civil and Environmental Engineering

Civil Engineering	MSCE	PhD	14080100	
Environmental Engineering	MENVE		14140100	

Human Development and Family Studies

Human Development and Family Studies	MS	PhD	19070100	
HDFS	MS		30110100	
HDFS-(Gerontology)				CERT

Mechanical Engineering

Mechanical Engineering	MSME	PhD	14190100	

Interdisciplinary and Graduate School

Museum Science and Heritage Management	MA		30140100	
Interdisciplinary Studies	MA/MS		3099901	
Biotechnology-Science and Agriculture	MS		26120100	
Arid Land Studies	MS		3010400	
Wind Science Engineering (WISE)		PhD	14130100	CERT
Women's Studies				CERT
Forensic Science	MS		43010600	
Wind Energy Technical				CERT
Wind Energy Managerial				CERT

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2015-2016

Plant and Soil Science

Horticultural Landscape Management	MS		1060100	CERT
Plant & Soil Science (Agronomy)	MS	PhD	1110200	
Plant Protection (was Entomology)	MS		26070200	
Fibers and Bipolymers				CERT

*Plant & Soil Science (Crop Science) and Soil Science were phased out as of 2013-2014

(2015-2016 cont'd next page)

(2015-2016 continued)

Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures

Romance Languages	**MA**		**16090000**	
Applied Linguistics	**MA**		**16010500**	
German	**MA**		**16050100**	
Romance Languages-Spanish	**MA**		**16090000**	
Spanish		**PhD**	**16090500**	
Classics	**MA**		**16120000**	
Teaching English in International Contexts				**CERT**

Communication Studies

Communication Studies	**MA**		**23130400**	

Geosciences

Geosciences	**MS**	**PhD**	**40060100**	
Atmospheric Science	**MS**		**40040100**	
Geography	**MS**		**45070100**	

Mathematics and Statistics

Mathematics	**MA/MS**	**PhD**	**27010100**	
Statistics	**MS**		**27050100**	

Petroleum Engineering

Petroleum Engineering	**MS**	**PhD**	**14250100**	**CERT**

Visual and Performing Arts – Art

Art	**MFA**		**50070100**	
Art Education	**MAE**		**13130200**	
Fine Arts - Art		**PhD**	**50010100**	
Art History			**50070300**	

Business Administration

General Business	**MBA**		**52020100**	
International Business Administration	**IMBA**		**52110100**	
Business Administration	**MS**	**PhD**	**52020100**	
Accounting	**MSA**		**52030100**	
Health Care Change				**CERT**
Management Information System	**MS**		**11040100**	

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2016-2017

Agricultural Education and Communications (MAY MOVE TO NEXT YEAR)

Agricultural Education	**MS**	**EdD**	**13130100**	

(2016-2017 Cont'd next page)

(2016-2017 continued)

Education-Curriculum & Instruction

Bilingual Education	MEd		13020100	
Curriculum and Instruction	MEd	PhD	13030100	
Elementary Education	MEd		13120200	
Secondary Education	MEd		13120500	
Language/Literacy Education	MEd		13131500	
Master Mentor Teacher				CERT
Multidisciplinary Science	MS			

Education-Educational Psychology & Leadership

Educational Leadership	MEd	EdD	13040100	
Instructional Technology – Distance Educ	MEd	EdD	13050100	
Higher Education	MEd	EdD/PhD	13060100	
Special Education	MEd	EdD	13100100	
Counselor Education	MEd	PhD	13110100	
Education Psychology	MEd	PhD	42280600	
Dual Sensory Impairment				CERT
Mental Health Counseling				CERT
Autism				CERT

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Electrical Engineering	MSEE	PhD	14100100	

Mass Communications (College)

Mass Communications	MA	PhD	9010200	

Psychology

Psychology	MA		42010100	
Clinical Psychology		PhD	42280100	
Counseling Psychology	MA	PhD	42280300	
General Experimental Psychology	MA	PhD	42270400	

Philosophy

Philosophy	MA		38010100	
Ethics				CERT

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2017-2018

Agricultural Education and Communications

Agricultural Communication	MS		1080200	

(2017-2018 Cont'd next page)

(2017-2018 continued)

Animal Science

Animal Science	MS	PhD	1090100	
Food Science	MS		1100100	

Computer Science

Computer Science	MS	PhD	11010100	
Software Engineering	MS		14090300	CERT

English

English	MA	PhD	23010100	
Technical Communication	MA		23130300	
Technical Communication & Rhetoric		PhD	23130300	
Linguistics				CERT

Health, Exercise and Sport Science

Exercise and Sport Sciences	MS		31050500	

Natural Resources Management (Formerly RWFM)

Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlands Sciences and Management	MS	PhD	3060100	

Visual and Performing Arts – Theatre & Dance

Theatre Arts	MA/MFA		50050100	

Masters of Engineering

Master of Engineering	MS		14010100	
Master of Bioengineering	MS		14050100	

Environmental Toxicology

Environmental Toxicology	MS	PhD	26100400	

Programs within departments to be reviewed **2018-2019**

Biological Sciences

Biology	MS	PhD	26010100	
Microbiology	MS		26050200	
Zoology	MS	PhD	26070100	

Design

Environmental Design	MS		19060100	
Interior and Environmental Design		PhD	4040100	

History

History	MA	PhD	54010100	

(2018-2019 Cont'd next page)

Industrial Engineering

Industrial Engineering	**MSIE**	**PhD**	**14350100**	
Systems and Engineering Management	**MS**	**PhD**	**14270100**	

Political Science & Public Administration

Public Administration	**MPA**		**44040100**	
Political Science	**MA**	**PhD**	**45100100**	

Nutrition, Hospitality and Retailing

Nutritional Sciences	**MS**	**PhD**	**19050100**	
Nutritional Dietetics	**(BS only – need to pull data**		**51310100**	
Hospitality and Retail Management	**MS**		**52090400**	
Hospitality Administration		**PhD**	**52090100**	

Preferred Schedule for Each Program Review

June/July 2013:   IRIM, in conjunction with The Graduate School Unit Coordinator, collect the metric data for the academic units being reviewed and submits the raw data to the Graduate School Unit Coordinator who converts the data to charts, graphs and tables. The Graduate School Unit Coordinator also collects ORS and financial data, and converts to charts, graphs and tables.

July/Aug 2013:   Department Chair Orientation
The Associate Dean of the Graduate School responsible for program reviews and the Graduate School Unit CoordinatorUnit Coordinator meet with the department chairs in an orientation meeting to discuss the review process. The college Deans involved are also informed. The Graduate School delivers self-study templates and Guidelines to the departments. Access to the self-studies on the GS Sharepoint will be given later.

Aug 2013:   The department submits a list of peer institutions to the Graduate School.

July/Aug 2013:   The Graduate School Unit Coordinator gathers peer institution data.

Sept. 2013:   The Graduate School completes the Sharepoints for the departments with the prior 6 year academic data for the self-study (with the exception of the year just passed) and notifies the department chairs of the availability and the access information.

Sept. 2013:   Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM) sends the faculty and the student surveys for the academic units being reviewed.

Sept-Nov 2013   The Graduate School Unit Coordinator monitors each departments progress and may add and/or change GS managed data as needed.

Nov. 15, 2013:   The department submits an electronic copy of the completed self-study document to the Graduate School.

Nov-Dec. 2013:   Review Committee Orientation

Dec 2013   The review committee members meet to begin to review data and plan a schedule for their review.

Jan 2014 - Mar 2014: Committeeconducts review including bringing the external reviewer(s) onsite, and having the department chair coordinate the rooms and meetings with the faculty and students as well as the tour of the facilities. The committee is responsible for coordinating the schedule for the external reviewer(s) but the external reviewer(s) makes and pays for their own travel arrangements and is/are reimbursed by Tech.

March 1, 2014:   The review committee submits their Program Response Form which should include comments from the external committee member's Program Response Forms. The external reviewer's Program Response Forms are expected within two weeks of their trip – one copy to the Graduate School and one copy to the committee chair. The External Reviewers submit separate invoices for travel and their report to the Graduate School Unit Coordinator.

March-April 2014:   The Graduate School Unit Coordinator schedules a final program review meeting with the Provost, Vice President for Research, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School responsible for program reviews, the Graduate School Unit Coordinator, the Dean of the College of the academic unit being reviewed,

the Chair of the academic unit being reviewed, and the internal review committee members.

March-April , 2014:   The College Dean and Department Chair submit a response report to the Provost, with a copy to the Graduate School (two weeks after meeting with the Provost). This report outlines what actions they plan to take in the coming year and what actions they plan to take in the following 5 years. They also submit a separate summary report for the HECB to the Graduate School to be forwarded to the HECB.

* *

<u>Graduate Program Review Process</u>

<u>Notification of Department Review:</u> During the summer of the academic year for which the academic unit is to be reviewed, the Graduate School Associate Dean meets with the Chairs of the academic units in a group orientation meeting to explain the review process and establish a timetable. The Chairs are given the sections of the self-study their department is responsible for completing in a 'Sharepoint Template' so they and their staff can begin work on those components of the review. The program review Guidelines are also given to the Chairs at this meeting.

The Chairs are asked to create a list of approximately five peer institutions, which will be used as benchmark institutions in the review process, which should come from the university list of peer institutions found in Appendix A of the Guidelines.

The Deans of the Colleges of all the departments within their college that are to be reviewed that year are notified and a link/copy of the Graduate Program Review Guidelines is attached to that email.

<u>Gathering Preliminary Information:</u> The Graduate School staff assists the academic unit in the preparation of a self-study document by gathering necessary data on the academic unit. Internal information is gathered from Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM), the Office of Research Services (ORS) and Graduate School records. Department specific information on the areas is collected during the summer prior to the academic year and during early fall of the academic year for which the unit is to be reviewed, such as:

- Number and type of degrees awarded
- Undergraduate and graduate semester credit hours
- The number of majors in the department for the past five fall semesters
- Demographics of applicants and enrolled students
- Test scores of students and applicants on GRE, GMAT and TOEFL
- Graduate GPAs
- Scholarships and fellowships awarded to students by the Graduate School
- Course enrollments by Academic Year, Fall, Spring and Summer
- Teaching resources
- SCH/FTE generation
- The departmental operating funds
- External and internal grants and contracts awarded

Peer Institution Information (see Appendix A): The Graduate School staff also gathers information from the peer institutions that are recommended by the unit being reviewed on the areas shown below and include that information in the self-study. The Chairperson of the academic unit may obtain more peer institution information if desired. Requests for additional peer institution information must reach the graduate school prior to sending out the initial requests for information.

- Number and type of degrees awarded
- Enrollment figures at all levels
- The number tenured, tenure-track and teaching assistants
- External and internal grants and contracts awarded

Surveys: The Graduate School commissions' studies to be anonymously administered by IRIM to the current graduate student and faculty base. The questions on the surveys were professionally created and include open-ended questions to maximize the information that can be gained from the input received through this means. **(see Appendix B for an example)**

Preparation of the 'Program Self-Study': The Department Chairperson of the academic unit being reviewed is ultimately responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study. The Chairperson may designate another faculty member or a team of faculty members to carry out the self-study compilation, but should be continually and actively involved in overseeing the preparation of the self-study. **All faculty members should be involved in the preparation of the self-study.** The participation of enrolled students, alumni and professional staff is highly encouraged. The self-study should be evaluative rather than simply descriptive. It should be more than just a collection of data, but a document of academic judgment about the program(s), students, curriculum, resources, and future directions of the academic unit. **The self-study should not be a document that describes a budget request, but one that describes administrative information of the unit's strengths, areas to strengthen, plans, and goals.** Note that a self-serving document, in some measure, loses credibility. The Graduate School has a number of self-studies available for review. The format of the self-study document is shown below:

Program Self-Study' Format

Department Chairperson or their designee compiles the self-study with data supplied by the Graduate School. It is prepared in Word format and in separate chapters on Sharepoint, the access address will be provided by the Graduate School. When the self-study is finished, the Department Chair notifies the Graduate School Unit Coordinator and the Sharepoint will be locked from further changes..

I.   Program Overview – A one to two-page summary of department's vision and goals.
(Items II-V, include tables, charts, and discussion of each item as well as comparison with peer institutions where appropriate.)

II.   Graduate Curricula and Degree Programs
        (Include any special problems courses – provide either syllabus or course description and outline)
        A. Scope of programs within the department
        B. Number and types of degrees awarded
        C. Undergraduate and Graduate semester credit hours

D. Course enrollments over the past six years (enrollment trends)
E. Courses cross listed (with syllabus for both ug and grad individual courses)

III. Faculty
A. Number, rank and demographics of the faculty (tenured and tenure track), GPTI's and TA's
B. List of faculty members (graduate and non-graduate)
C. Summary of the number of refereed publications and creative activities
D. Responsibilities and leadership in professional societies
E. Assess average faculty productivity

IV. Graduate Students
A. Demographics of applicants and enrolled students
B. Test scores (GRE, GMAT or TOEFL) of enrolled students
C. GPA of new students
D. Time to Degree in Years
E. Breakdown of how many enrolled graduate students are RA's. TA's or GPTI's
F. Initial position and place of employment of graduates over the past 6 years
G. Type of financial support available for graduate students.
H. Number of students who have received national and university fellowships, scholarships and other awards
I. Percentage (%) of full time students receiving financial support
J. Graduate Student Publications and Creative Activities
K. Programs for mentoring and professional preparation of graduate students.
L. Department efforts to retain students and graduation rates
M. Percentage of Full Time Master and Doctoral students per year – Fall Data

V. Department
A. Department operating expenses
B. Summary of Proposals (Submitted)
C. External Research expenditures
D. Internal funding
E. Scholarships and endowments
F. Departmental resources for research and teaching (i.e. classroom space, lab facilities)
G. HEAF expenditures
H. External Program Accreditation

VI. Conclusion – – a one- to two-page summary of the observed deficiencies and needs identified by your review. Highlight areas of greatest need and areas of significant contributions.

VII. Appendices – should include, but not be limited to, the following (must include cover pages for each Appendices):
Table of Contents
A. Strategic plan
B. Curriculum Map
C. 18 Characteristics of Doctoral Programs

D. Graduate Course Offerings
   E. Graduate Student Handbook
   F. Graduate Student Association(s) - Description and information
   G. Graduate Faculty Information (from Digital Measures)

VIII. Surveys – Faculty and Student Surveys

All data provided by the Graduate School in the self-study needs to be discussed with respect to the program or programs reviewed. A sample can be found in Appendix B.

In addition to the data provided as listed above, some place within the self-study the following items should be addressed (where applicable):

<u>**ADDITIONAL DATA THAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED:**</u> **(as applicable)**

Overall:

❖ What are the objectives of the program(s) under review?

Students:

❖ What basic guidelines are graduate students provided regarding the courses allowed for their program, and how many courses in their program are allowed to be taken outside the home department? What are the degree requirements?

❖ How many hours of courses are required for each program? What is the approximate time frame from start to finish (expected and actual) for the master and doctorate students to complete the program? Is there a way to reduce the time to completion without reducing the quality of the program?

❖ Are sufficient numbers of graduate level courses provided on a regular schedule for each program offered for your student population? Are there too many or not enough?

❖ What procedures exist to periodically review graduate course offerings and course content, and to review the teaching performance in those courses?

❖ Describe student recruitment, review of applicants, decisions on admittance of applicants, and how various financial assistance are awarded to both new and continuing students.

❖ What are the reasons graduate students leave the program prior to completion of their degree?

❖ How effective are the masters and doctorate recipients in publishing their thesis or dissertation?

❖ Are graduate students admitted into the program(s) if they are not receiving any assistantship? If not, please provide the policy for this process and the reasoning for the policy.

❖ Explain how students are allowed and encouraged to take classes from other departments.

Department:

- ❖ Describe any Centers or Institutes within the unit and how they contribute to or benefit the graduate programs?

- ❖ What procedures or policies exist with regards to faculty supervision of graduate students (advising), committee obligations, and interdisciplinary teaching activities?

- ❖ How are students involved in the governance and administration of the program(s)?

- ❖ What is the maximum number of students allowed in each graduate class and explain why you had such a maximum.

- ❖ What mission and goals exist and how do they accord with those of the college and the university?

- ❖ What measures are used to identify the quality of the program(s)?

- ❖ What challenges would the program face in maintaining or becoming a highly ranked program?

- ❖ To what degree were faculty involved in writing the self-study and did they review the final copy?

- ❖ What is the current number of graduate students each faculty are advising or directing their program?

- ❖ How is the progress and ultimate success of the program(s) evaluated?

- ❖ What is necessary to reach the evolving future given where the program is currently?

Selection of Review Committee Members: The overall review team consists of three internal (TTU faculty) and at least two external reviewers. The three-member internal review committee selection will be made by the Graduate Associate Dean and may include names suggested by the dean of the college or the Graduate School Dean. The internal committee will include at least one faculty member from a college outside the college of the academic unit being reviewed. Graduate faculty members will be invited to serve as committee review members as early as the fall semester of the academic year for which the academic unit will be reviewed. The number of external reviewer(s) will depend on the subject content of the program(s) reviewed and their respective sub-programs. All doctoral and master's programs will have at least two external reviewers and will be chosen from the peer institutions shown in Appendix A of the Guidelines by the Graduate Associate Dean by contacting those universities.

Submission of 'Program Self-Study': The self-study should be completed on a Graduate School Sharepoint no later than **November 15th** of the academic year for which the academic unit is being reviewed. The Graduate Associate Dean reviews the self-study document for content, completeness and accuracy, and requests the department to make revisions, if necessary. The Graduate School Unit Coordinator then sends the access information to the chair, the dean, and the committee.

The Review Process: The Graduate Associate Dean and the Graduate Unit Coordinator hold an Orientation Meeting with all the Review Committee members by **December 1st** of the academic year for which the academic units being reviewed. At this meeting, a committee chair is elected, and instructions and advice on the review process are given. The review committee schedules the entire on-site review process directly with the department chair, and coordinates all the arrangements with the external

reviewer(s). Within 2-3 weeks after the on-site review, the review committee submits its Program Response Form electronically to the Graduate School (ensuring that the external reviewers have submitted their reports so their comments are incorporated into the overall report). The external reviewers must also submit their Program Response Forms electronically to the Graduate School. This normally should occur by **March 1st** of the following year, but should occur within 2 weeks of the onsite review.

Assessment of Report Meeting: The meeting is usually scheduled for **March**. Attendance at this meeting consists of the academic Chair, the Dean of the college, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, the GS Unit Coordinator, the Provost, a representative from the Office of the Vice-President of Research, the internal review committee, and any other appropriate faculty/staff. At this meeting, the internal review committee chairperson provides a summary of the report followed by a response from the department chair. After a brief statement by the dean of the college, the Vice President of Research office, and the Graduate School Dean, the Provost makes the closing remarks. A discussion may follow as time permits. The time allotted for the meeting is approximately 1 hour.

Action of the Chair/Dean: After further consultation with the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School if needed, the college Dean and department Chair submit a brief report outlining the action items to be taken based on the outcome of the review including a time-table of these intended actions (those that will occur in the following year and those that will occur in the 5 years after that). This rerport should include specific action items to address the issues of concern found by the review committee. **The report should be submitted to the Associate Dean of the Graduate School no later than 2 weeks after the Assessment of Report meeting with the Provost. They also submit a separate summary report for the Higher Education Coordinating Board to the Graduate School who forward the report to the HECB.**

Follow Up: Approximately **one year after the completion** of the review of the program(s), the Department chair (or program director) provides the Graduate School with a report on changes based on action items made in response to the committee Program Response Forms, and any other items of importance. Once submitted, a meeting is scheduled with the Department Chair (or Program Director), the Dean of the college, the Graduate School Dean, and the Graduate School Associate Dean overseeing the review to discuss the outcome of the review based on the submitted report.

* *

Task of the Reviewers
(Based on the Program Self-Study compiled by the department)

Assessment: The task of the reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of the quality and effectiveness of graduate programs, and to determine where the program fits in the discipline regionally, nationally, and/or internationally. This evaluation is concerned primarily with the quality of education actually achieved by students and includes, but is not restricted to:

- The overall quality and direction of the program.
- An assessment of the quality of faculty in relationship to the students.
- The existence of policies and practices in support of students.
- Curriculum offerings and program options.
- The adequacy of staff support, physical facilities, library resources, equipment, research facilities and program budget.
- Comparison of the activities as they relate to the department/college strategic plan.

Sources: The review committee is encouraged to focus attention on questions regarding the relationship of programs to the goals of the university. The task of the reviewers is to recognize those features of the program that merit special commendation, and to make recommendations where there is room for improvement/enhancement. Reviewers should formulate their evaluations not only from the self-study document, but also from interviews with the unit chairperson, faculty members, and students. The interviews should be done separately.

The Program Response Form: The findings and recommendations of the committee are recorded and reported on the Program Response Form which is provided by the Graduate School Program Review Unit Coordinator. The form covers the5 categories listed on the next page and should include overall observations, reputation, strengths/commendations, deficiencies/recommendations, and value of the program to the mission of the university. Specific recommendations should be made regarding what is needed to strengthen programs that have deficiencies, or perhaps what is needed to lift an outstanding program to the top of its discipline. Specific recommendations should also be made for each program that do not require additional resources. Examples of past forms can be provided to the committee chair upon request.

Guidelines for Reviewers

During the review of each academic unit, reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the academic unit with respect to the areas shown below. Reviewers are to **give a rating for each area** so should keep that in consideration while reviewing each area. Ratings are Excellent, Very Good, Appropriate, Needs Improvement. Reviewers should not feel confined to the areas specified and can examine and comment on other areas that they deem important to the review process.

.

    A. **Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan** Reviewers should examine the mission and organization of the academic unit, paying special attention to program planning, vision, and program size and compare this to their current strategic plan.

B. **Program Curriculum** Factors that should be considered are: degree requirements, course offerings and frequency, areas of specialization, nature and type of qualifying exams. Reviewers should determine if the program is compatible with similar programs in peer institutions.

C. **Faculty Productivity** Factors that should be considered are: faculty profile, faculty scholarship and teaching awards, faculty teaching load, total faculty workload, and faculty service.

D. **Students and Graduates** Factors that should be considered are: student profile, student recruitment, student retention, program applicant pool, placement of graduates, career success of former students, student productivity, teaching/research assistant preparation, and support, and whether the program is at capacity and if so, why.

E. **Facilities and Resources** Determine if existing space, library resources, information technology, and support staff are adequate to support the program.

F. **Overall Ranking** Reviewers provide and overall summary of the review including sequence of events, interviews and tours that occurred, etc., and overall impression

Examples of Criteria for Assessment of Academic Programs

1. Excellence of teaching
2. Quality and quantity of research and scholarly activity
3. Effective organization and operation of the department and use of staff and facilities
4. Appropriateness and completeness of offerings
5. Ratio of degree production, considering staff and enrollment
6. Quality of students (background and performance)
7. Effectiveness of academic counseling and guidance program
8. Student-faculty communication in general
9. Faculty and student support
10. Library and research support
11. Adequacy of facilities and equipment
12. Definition, understanding, and acceptance of program goals
13. Student and faculty awareness of degree requirements
14. Willingness to collaborate in interdisciplinary academic programs
15. Quality of supporting programs
16. Quality of graduates
17. Post degree performance of graduates
18. How is distance education being incorporated into their program(s)
19. Are there a large number of dual-listed courses with undergraduate courses
20. Have a significant number of junior faculty left during this time period
21. Are a large number of courses taught with less than 10 students per semester
22. Does the survey from students show critical gaps in the program or it operation
23. Lack of facilities do conduct the research
24. Are the faculty serving on committees outside of their department and college

APPENDIX A:

PEER INSTITUTIONS

TTU Peer Institutions (alpha order – accessed 11/24/09)

Arizona State University
Auburn University
Clemson University
Florida State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Indiana University – Bloomington
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Louisiana State University – Baton Rouge
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
North Carolina State University
Ohio State University – Columbus
Oklahoma State University – Stillwater
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University – University Park
Purdue University – West Lafayette
Rutgers University – New Brunswick
Texas A&M University
University of Alabama – Tuscaloosa
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas – Fayetteville
University of California – Berkeley
University of California – Los Angeles
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Connecticut – Storrs
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
University of Kansas – Lawrence
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville
University of Maryland – College Park
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi – Oxford
University of Missouri – Columbia
University of Nebraska – Lincoln
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill
University of Oklahoma – Norman
University of Oregon
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina – Columbia
University of South Florida
University of Tennessee – Knoxville
University of Texas – Austin
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin – Madison
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Washington State University
West Virginia University

APPENDIX B:

SURVEYS, FACULTY AND STUDENT

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Graduate School™

Graduate Program Reviews
2012-2013

FACULTY AND STUDENT
SURVEY RESULTS

College:
Department:
Conducted by: Institutional Research and
Information Services

FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS –

Number of faculty participating in survey

Professor	
Asso.Prof	
Asst.Prof	
PARTICIPANT TOTAL	

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Average

Q-1 The facilities and equipment available to teach graduate courses are adequate.

Q-2 I have adequate access to facilities and equipment needed for my graduate work

Q-3 The quality and availability of departmental graduate student office space is adequate for my needs

Q-4 Library resources available to me are adequate

Q-5 Teaching resources (faculty, teaching assistants) are adequate to my needs

Q-6 The program offers an adequate selection of graduate courses, sufficient for timely completion of a full graduate program

Q-7 The graduate courses available are taught at an appropriate level and are of sufficient rigor.

Q-8 The graduate teaching assistants avaiable to faculty in the program are of appropriate quality

Q-9 Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support your program or minor, are sufficiently available

Q-10 There is adequate communication about policy and program changes in your department

Q-11   There is adequate communication from the upper administration regarding policy changes.

Q-12 I am satisfied with the professional interaction with faculty throughout TTU.

Q-13 Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support your program(s) or minors, are sufficiently accepted.

Q-14 Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support your program(s) or minors, are sufficiently recommended by your advisor(s).

Q-15 Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support your program(s) or minors, are sufficiently recommended by your advisor(s).

Q-16 I am satisfied with the professional interaction with the graduate program coordinator(s).

Q-17 I am satisfied with the professional interaction with other faculty within the program(s).

Q-18 I am treated as a respected contributor to the graduate program in which I am involved.

Q-19 I have been given an opportunity to be engaged in decisions regarding changes in the program(s).

Q-20 Course and program changes are evaluated by all faculty and voted upon by those faculty.

Q-21 Sufficient graduate teaching assistantship stipends are available.

Q-22 The program offers adequate opportunity for its faculty to gain teaching training.

Q-23 Graduate teaching assistantships assignments are made equitably, based on established criteria.

Q-24 Graduate program policies are clearly defined and readily available to me.

Q-25 Graduate program policies clearly identify petition and appeals procedures available.

What do you consider to be the strengths of your graduate program(s)?

What changes, if any, could be made to improve the quality of your graduate program(s)?

Please feel free to add any additional comments or questions in the space below.

STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS –	
Number of students participating in survey	
Doctoral	
Master's Thesis	
Other	
PARTICIPANT TOTAL	

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Average

Q-1   The research facilities and equipment available for my graduate research meet my needs

Q-2   I have adequate access to facilities and equipment needed for my graduate work

Q-3   The quality and availability of departmental graduate student office space is adequate for my needs

Q-4 Library resources available to me are adequate for my needs

Q-5 Teaching resources (faculty, teaching assistants) are adequate to my needs

Q-6 The program offers an adequate selection of graduate courses, sufficient for timely completion of a full graduate program

Q-7   The graduate courses available are taught at an appropriate level and are of sufficient rigor.

Q-8 The graduate teaching by faculty in the program is of appropriate quality

Q-9 Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support my program or minor, are sufficiently available

Q-10 Program seminars are adequate to keep me informed of developments in my field

Q-11   The initial advising I received when I entered the program was an adequate orientation

Q-12 I have a department mailbox or other form of communication with faculty & graduate students

Q-13 I have adequate access to my major professor

Q-14 I am receiving the research and professional development guidance I need

Q-15 I am satisfied with the professional interaction with my major professor

Q-16 I am satisfied with the professional interaction with faculty both within the program and at TTU

Q-17 I am treated as a respected contributor to the research program in which I am involved

Q-18 I have been given an opportunity to be engaged in significant research for my thesis or dissertation

Q-19 If I decide to change my major professor, the mechanism for doing so is suitable

Q-20 I am informed of opportunities for professional development and contacts outside TTU, such as attendance at professional meetings

Q-21 Graduate teaching or research assistantship stipends are adequate

Q-22 The program offers adequate opportunity for its graduate students to gain teaching experience

Q-23 Graduate teaching assistantships, assignments are made equitably, based on established criteria

Q-24 Program policies are clearly defined and readily available to me

Q-25 Graduate program policies clearly identify petition and appeals procedures available to me

Q-26 There is a well-established mechanism for regular graduate student participation in decisions affecting students, whenever this is appropriate

What do you consider to be strengths of this program?

What do you consider to be the weaknesses of this program?

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

What changes, if any, could be made to improve the quality of this graduate program?

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Please feel free to add any additional comments or questions in the space below.

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |