TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Graduate School™

Graduate Program Review Guidelines

Staff Involved in Program Review

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

Peggy Gordon Miller
Dean of the Graduate School   x226
email: peggy.miller@ttu.edu

Clifford Fedler
Associate Dean of the Graduate School   x232
email: clifford.fedler@ttu.edu

Marlene Kenady
Analyst II   x227
email: marlene.kenady@ttu.edu

****

Introduction

The main objective of periodic 6-year program reviews is to provide a mechanism for maintaining or 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 mission of the university. The results 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 2010-2011

Agricultural Education and Communications

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Agricultural Education	MS	EdD	131301	
Agricultural Communication	MS		010802	

Computer Science

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Computer Science	MS	PhD	110101	
Software Engineering	MS		140903	CERT

Education-Curriculum & Instruction

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Bilingual Education	MEd		130201	
Curriculum and Instruction	MEd	PhD	130301	
Elementary Education	MEd		131202	
Secondary Education	MEd		131205	
Language/Literacy Education	MEd		131315	
Multidisciplinary Science	MS		131316	
Master Mentor Teacher				CERT

Education-Educational Psychology & Leadership

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Educational Leadership	MEd	EdD	130401	
Instructional Technology	MEd	EdD	130501	
Higher Education	MEd	EdD/PhD	130601	
Special Education	MEd	EdD	131001	
Counselor Education	MEd	PhD	131101	
Education Psychology	MEd	PhD	421801	
Dual Sensory Impairment				CERT
Mental Health Counseling				CERT
Autism				CERT

Electrical and Computer Engineering

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Electrical Engineering	MSEE	PhD	140001/ 141001	

Mass Communications (College)

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Mass Communications	MA	PhD	090401/ 090102	

Psychology

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Psychology	MA		420101	
Clinical Psychology		PhD	420201	
Counseling Psychology	MA	PhD	420601	
General Experimental Psychology	MA	PhD	420801	

Philosophy

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Philosophy	MA		380101	
Ethics				CERT

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2011-2012

Animal Science

	Masters	Doctoral	CIP	CERTs
Animal Science	MS	PhD	101901/ 010901	
Food Technology	MS		011001	

(2011-2012 Continued on next page)

English

English	MA	PhD	230101	
Technical Communication	MA		231101	
Technical Communication & Rhetoric		PhD	231101	
Linguistics				CERT

Health, Exercise and Sport Science

Exercise and Sport Sciences	MS		310501	

Industrial Engineering

Industrial Engineering	MSIE	PhD	143501	
Manufacturing Systems Engineering	MS		143601	
Systems and Engineering Management	MS	PhD	149999	

Natural Resources Management (Formerly RWFM)

Range Science	MS	PhD	011106	
Fisheries Science	MS	PhD	030301	
Wildlife Science	MS	PhD	030601	

Visual and Performing Arts – Theatre & Dance

Theatre Arts	MA/MFA		500501	
Theatre Arts-Design	MFA		500502	
Theatre Arts-Playwriting	MFA		500504	
Theatre Arts-Act/Directing (Performance & Pedagogy)	MFA		500506	
Theatre Arts-Theatre Management	MFA		500508	
Fine Arts-Theatre Arts		PhD	500501	

Masters of Engineering

Master of Engineering	MS		140101	
Master of Bioengineering	MS		140501	

Environmental Toxicology

Environmental Toxicology	MS	PhD	261009	

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2012-2013

Biological Sciences

Biology	MS	PhD	260101	
Zoology	MS	PhD	260701	
Biological Informatics	MS		261103	

Design

Environmental Design	MS		190601	

History

History	MA	PhD	540101	

Political Science & Public Administration

Public Administration	MPA		440401	
Political Science	MA	PhD	451001	

Masters of Agriculture

Masters of Agriculture	MAG		010000	

Nutrition, Hospitality and Retailing

Nutritional Sciences	MS	PhD	190501	
Restaurant, Hotel & Institutional Management	MS		520904	
Hospitality Administration		PhD	520901	

Programs within departments to be reviewed **2013-2014**

Agricultural and Applied Economics

Agricultural and Applied Economics	MS	PhD	010103	

Chemical Engineering

Chemical Engineering	MS CHE	PhD	140701	

Economics

Economics	MS	PhD	450601	

Landscape Architecture

Landscape Architecture	MLA		040601	

Physics

Physics	MS	PhD	400801	
Applied Physics	MS		400890	

Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work

Anthropology	MA		450201	
Sociology	MA		451101	

Visual and Performing Arts – Music

Music Education	MMED		131312	
Fine Arts – Music		PhD	500901	
Music History & Literature (Musicology)	MM		500905	
Performance	MM	DMA	500903	
Composition	MM	DMA	500904	
Music Theory	MM		500904	
Music Conducting		DMA	500906	
Music Piano Pedagogy		DMA	500907	CERT
Pedagogy	MM		500912	

Programs within departments to be reviewed **2014-2015**

Applied & Professional Studies

Family & Consumer Sciences Education	MS	PhD	131308	
Environmental Design		PhD	040401	
Marriage & Family Therapy	MS	PhD	511505	
Personal Financial Planning	MS	PhD	190401/ 520804	CERT
Addictions and the Family				CERT

Architecture

Architecture	MARCH/MS		040201	
Land Use Planning, Management & Design		PhD	030206	
Historic Preservation				CERT
Visualization				CERT
Community Design and Development				CERT

Chemistry and Biochemistry

Chemistry	MS	PhD	400501	

Civil and Environmental Engineering

Civil Engineering	MSCE	PhD	140801	
Environmental Engineering	MENVE		141401	
Environmental Technology Management	MSETM		141401	

Human Development and Family Studies

Human Development and Family Studies	MS	PhD	190701	
Gerontology				CERT

(2014-2015 Continued on next page)

Mechanical Engineering

Mechanical Engineering	MSME	PhD	141901	

Interdisciplinary and Graduate School

Museum Science	MA		301401	
Heritage Management	MS		301201	
Interdisciplinary Studies	MA/MS		309999	
Biotechnology-Science and Agriculture	MS		261201	
Forensic Science	MS		N/A	
Wind Science Engineering (WISE)		PhD	141301	CERT
Women's Studies				CERT

Programs within departments to be reviewed 2015-2016

Plant and Soil Science

Horticulture	MS		010601	CERT
Plant & Soil Science		PhD	011102	
Crop Science	MS		011104	CERT
Soil Science	MS		011201	CERT
Plant Protection (was Entomology)	MS		260702	
Fibers and Textiles				CERT

Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures

Romance Languages	MA		160101	
Applied Linguistics	MA		160102	
German	MA		160501	
Romance Languages-French	MA		160101	
Romance Languages-Spanish	MA		160101	
Spanish		PhD	160905	
Classics	MA		161200	
Teaching English in International Contexts				CERT

Communication Studies

Communication Studies	MA		231001	

Geosciences

Geosciences	MS	PhD	400601	
Atmospheric Science	MS		400401	
Geography				

Mathematics and Statistics

Mathematics	MA/MS	PhD	270101	
Statistics	MS		270501	

Petroleum Engineering

Petroleum Engineering	MS	PhD	142501	CERT

Visual and Performing Arts – Art

Art	MFA		500701	
Art Education	MAE		131302	
Fine Arts - Art		PhD	500701	CERT

Business Administration

General Business	MBA		520201	
International Business Administration	IMBA		521101	
Business Administration	MS	PhD	520201	
Accounting	MSA		520301	
Health Care Change				CERT

Tentative Schedule for Each Program Review

June/July 2010:	The Associate Dean of the Graduate School responsible for program reviews and the Graduate School Analyst meet with the department chair to discuss the review process and inform the college Dean. The Graduate School delivers guidelines for the self-study to the department.
June/July 2010:	IRIM, in conjunction with The Graduate School Analyst, collect the metric data for the academic units being reviewed.
July 2010:	The department submits a list of peer institutions to the Graduate School.
Sept. 2010:	The Graduate School submits the prior academic year data for the self-study to the department.
Sept. 2010:	Institutional Research sends the faculty and the student surveys for the academic units being reviewed.
Nov. 15, 2010:	The department submits an original paper copy and an electronic copy of the completed self-study document to the Graduate School, and includes an account number for approximately 10 copies to be made by the Graduate School.
Dec. 1, 2010:	The review committee members meet to begin to review data and plan a schedule for their review.
Dec 2010 - Mar 2011:	Committee conducts review including bringing the external reviewer (where applicable) 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 any external reviewer(s) but the external reviewer makes and pays for their own travel arrangements and is reimbursed by Tech.
March 1, 2011:	The review committee submits their final report. (The external reviewer's report is expected within two weeks of their trip – one copy to the Graduate School and one copy to the committee chair.)
March 2011:	The Graduate School schedules a final program review meeting with the Provost, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School responsible for program reviews, the dean of the college of the academic unit being reviewed, the chair of the academic unit being reviewed, and the review committee members.
April 20, 2011:	The supervising dean and chair submit a response statement to the Provost, with a copy to the Graduate School (or two weeks after meeting with the Provost)..

* *

Graduate Program Review Process

Notification of Department Review: During the summer, prior to the academic year for which the academic unit is to be reviewed, the Graduate School Associate Dean meets with the chair of the academic unit to explain the review process and establish a timetable. The program review guidelines are given to the chair at this meeting.

The chair will be asked to create a list of approximately five peer institutions, which will be used as benchmark institutions in the review process. Also, the chair is asked to create a list of names of graduate faculty members who can serve as internal reviewers for that department. Internal review committee members cannot be from the department to be reviewed, and no more than two should be from another department in the same college. The other committee member names should be from departments outside the college.

The academic dean of the college is notified of all the departments within their college that will be reviewed that year and a copy of the program review guidelines are attached to that memo.

Gathering Preliminary Information: 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 the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Research Services and the 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: 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

Preparation of the 'Program Self-Study': The 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, 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, 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 compiles in a binder and with data supplied by the Graduate School)

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. Number of majors in the department
E. Course offerings and their enrollments over the past six years (enrollment trends by course)
F. 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. Provide a 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. Average financial support provided.
K. Graduate Student Publications and Creative Activities
L. Programs for mentoring and professional preparation of graduate students.
M. Department efforts to retain students and graduation rates
N. Percentage of Full Time students per semester

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:
Table of Contents
A. Strategic plan
B. Graduate Course Offerings
C. Graduate Student Handbook
D. Graduate Student Association(s) - Description and information
E. Graduate Faculty Information (current Confirmation/Reconfirmation form packets for all tenured and tenure-track faculty)

All data provided by the Graduate School in the self study needs to be discussed with respect to the program or programs reviewed.

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

ADDITIONAL DATA THAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED: (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?

- ❖ How effective are the masters and doctorate recipients in publishing their final 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: A 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 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. At least one outside reviewer dedicated to curriculum issues for all doctoral programs will be selected by the Graduate School.

Submission of 'Program Self-Study': The self-study is forwarded to the office of the Graduate Dean (02 Holden Hall) no later than the **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. Ten copies of the final version of the self-study are made by the Graduate school and charged to an account number of the reviewed department. The Graduate School distributes the copies including copies to the chair, the dean, and the committee.

The Review Process: The Graduate Associate Dean meets with the review committee members by **December 1st** of the academic year for which the academic unit is being reviewed. At this meeting, a committee chair is elected, and instructions and advice on the review process are given. The review committee submits its report to the Graduate School no later than **February 15th** of the following year.

Assessment of Report: A meeting is 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 Provost, the Office of the Vice-President of Research, the review committee, and any other appropriate faculty/staff. At this meeting, the committee chairperson provides a summary of the report followed by a response from the academic 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 Dean: After further consultation with the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School, the college Dean and department Chair submit a brief statement outlining the action items to be taken based on the outcome of the review including a time-table of these intended actions. This statement should include specific action items to address the issues of concern found by the review committee. **The statement 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.**

Follow Up: Approximately **one year after the completion** of the review of the program(s), the chair of the department (or program director) provides the Graduate School with a report on changes based on action items made in response to the committee report 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.

* *

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 Executive Report: The findings and recommendations of the committee should take the format of a concise one to two-page executive summary at the beginning. The remainder of the report 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. A standard format for this report will be provided to the committee chair.

Grade Assessment: Reviewers rate the program under review versus peer institutions and provide a graded assessment:
- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor
- Unsatisfactory

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** as per the scale provided in the "Grade Assessment" section. 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.

Executive Summary
Reviewers provide and overall summary of the review including sequence of events, interviews and tours that occurred, etc., and overall impression.

Program Overview and Vision (rating)
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.

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

Quality and Quantity of Graduate Students and Graduates (rating)
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.

Curriculum and Programs of Study (rating)
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.

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

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