Procedures for Review of Existing Graduate Programs

1. Graduate Program reviews will routinely take place on five- to seven-year cycles either by initiation of the Graduate School or Graduate Program.

2. The first step in the process is for the Graduate Program designee (Dean, Department Chair or Graduate Program Director) to meet with the Dean of the Graduate School to determine the content of the self-study report. The timetable is discussed.

3. The self-study report is prepared within a period of two- to four-months time and then submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School.

4. A list of potential External Reviewers with expertise in the program will be submitted to the Graduate School along with an explanation of any relationships they may have to the faculty of the department no later than by the time the self-study report is completed.

5. The Dean of the Graduate School will select a committee comprised of three UM graduate faculty members (Internal Reviewers) from outside of the program who will review the self-study report. Their task is to make recommendations to the Graduate Program before the document goes to the External Committee. This same group of three will attend the exit meeting with the External Reviewers and the Dean of the Graduate School on the final day of the site visit to hear the recommendations for improving the program. As a final task, the Internal Reviewers will attend the Graduate Council meeting where the final report will be presented to the Council.

6. A rank ordering of the potential External Reviewers will be determined by the Dean of the Graduate School. The scheduling of the site visit date will be done by the Graduate School in consultation with the program faculty and their Dean, dependent on the availability of the reviewers.

7. The Graduate School will arrange requisite appointments with the Dean of the Graduate School and Provost for the upcoming site visit. Meanwhile the program will use the sample schedule to set up the other site visit details.

8. Once the document is updated with the Internal Reviewers’ suggestions and the site visit schedule is in place, the document is distributed to the External Reviewers. Thirty days prior to the visit is the preferred lead time.

9. See attached sample schedule for the site visit.

10. The External Committee will submit their 10-15 page report to the Dean of the Graduate School within 30 days of their site visit. The external report is then shared with the Graduate Program and the Internal Reviewers. The department prepares a written response to the external report. The Internal Reviewers prepare a written response to the external report and the departmental response.

11. The report from the External Reviewers, the Internal Committee memo of response and the program response are presented to the Graduate Council. If the Graduate Council accepts the reports, the program review will be considered accepted.

12. The Dean of the School, Department Chair, Graduate Program Director, Dean of the Graduate School meets with the Provost to discuss the program review.

13. With the approval of the Provost, the documents are then forwarded to the SACS office (digital copy needed). The Graduate School sends a memo to Faculty Senate and the Graduate Program indicating the program review was approved. The Faculty Senate does not require the full document.
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

An assessment of your department’s existing programs and identification of areas that might need future change will help your department to successfully implement its Strategic Plan. Please provide the Graduate School with the following information:

1. Degrees
   a. Discuss the programs and provide exact titles of degrees offered by your department.
   b. Discuss the purpose and goals of each program and degree.
   c. Assess job market demand for students possessing degrees offered by your department.
   d. Can courses offered by your programs be taken for credit by students in other departments and applied toward earning degrees outside your department?

2. Current Strategic Plan
   a. An indication of the direction the program will take in the next five years.
   b. Areas of strength
   c. Resource allocation, reallocation and needs.

3. Resources
   a. Assess the adequacy of all library resources and services.
   b. List and evaluate all existing equipment and facilities in your department.
   c. List equipment currently needed by your department’s programs and provide estimates on how much new equipment will cost.
   d. Project what you anticipate your department’s equipment needs will be in the next 5 years and provide estimates on cost.
   e. Evaluate the adequacy of existing classroom and laboratory space.
   f. Project what you anticipate your department’s space needs will be for the next 5 years.

4. Curriculum
   a. List all courses taught in the last five years and by whom.
   b. List anticipated additions, deletions, or other changes in your course offerings for the next 5 years.
   c. Describe any current, anticipated, or agreed upon cooperative or interdisciplinary work with other departments of the University or with any outside agency related to your department’s programs.
   d. Is there currently any expertise in your department that is untapped?
   e. List and describe tracks for various degrees offered by your department.
   f. Describe the kinds of teaching, e.g., clinical, classroom, independent research, seminars, etc., used by your faculty and what proportion of each is used.
   g. Quantify the distribution of graduate students to advisors.
   h. Is the program accredited by an appropriate agency? If not, explain why.
   i. Provide statistics on the format and passing rates of qualifying exams required by your department.
   j. Describe any colloquia series, special seminars, or conferences your department has held.
5. Faculty
   a. Provide a complete CV for each member of your department and for each member of an outside department who participates in your department’s program offerings.
   b. Estimate your department’s need for additional faculty in the next 5 years.
   c. Describe any interaction your department has with other graduate programs, e.g., extra-departmental thesis and dissertation committees.
   d. Share any faculty attitudes or opinions that you think are pertinent to this report.
   e. Criteria for membership in graduate faculty

6. Students
   a. Describe general requirements for admission to your programs and completion of your department’s degrees.
   b. Describe teaching or research positions currently held by graduates of your departments.
   c. Describe how TAs, RAs, etc., in your department are trained.
   d. Submit degree abstracts.
   e. How do you assess the quality of the applicants to your program?
   f. How do you assess the program’s retention rate and time to graduation?
   g. How do you assess your placement of graduates?

7. Administration
   a. Describe the academic direction of current programs and how they are administered day-to-day.
   b. Describe the academic policy-making mechanisms in place to oversee your department’s programs. Are faculty included in these mechanisms? If so, what is the criteria for their participation?

8. Overall Quality Assessment
   a. Do you think your department currently offers programs and an environment that facilitates and enhances student learning? State the method used to gather the information.
   b. Do you think your faculty members feel professionally and personally fulfilled? If the response is negative, what changes do you think will improve the situation?

9. Provide any other information that you think is pertinent.
SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING. These specific questions (modified and augmented from the Council of Graduate Schools Graduate Program Review) were used to guide our collection and analysis of data. We believe they are useful to guide your self-study and strategic planning within the context of the overarching components listed later in this document:

Who are you?

What do you do? Why do you do it?

How well do you do it and who thinks so? Are you competitive for the highest quality graduate students? How do you know?

What difference does it make whether you do it or not? How do you know?

Do your students, faculty, university, or disciplinary trends demand that you do something different? If so, what would that be?

And how do you intend to change to reach your (evolving) future given where you are now?

How will you evaluate your progress and ultimate success?

OVERARCHING COMPONENTS. The following four areas as overarching components for a self-study. We believe that these are a reasonable set of components that lend themselves to qualitative and quantitative measurements that begin to define a quality graduate education program.

Capacity to educate/train in the discipline: depth and breadth

What are the disciplinary capabilities of the faculty who educate graduate students? What is missing from these capabilities given the future of your discipline? What are your admissions criteria (and why)?

Does the education/training provided by the unit adequately prepare the graduate degree recipient to compete in the discipline as an equal both in depth of education/training and in breadth of education/training with degree recipients from other institutions? (Ability to compete includes competition for employment, advancement, intellectual equality and professional recognition.) How do you know?

What (if anything) do your disciplinary/professional societies say about the future of your discipline and of graduate education in your discipline?

For which employment sector(s) do you train your students? How do you know? (This question also permits differentiation between non-thesis master’s programs and the thesis-based master’s programs and doctoral programs).
What is the general quality of the applicants to your graduate pool? When was each of your core courses last offered?

**Capacity to mentor graduate students: depth and breadth**

How are the graduate students mentored so that they possess the extra-disciplinary skills necessary for success throughout their professional careers? This includes a broad range of skills ranging from written and oral communication skills through management skills to the balancing of conflicting personal and professional priorities. Also included should be guidance in the publications and grant-seeking practices of the discipline.

How effective is your mentoring? How do you know?

What are the efforts to provide education in the area of responsible conduct of research? In teaching/pedagogy?

**Infrastructure**

Does the unit have the necessary infrastructure for a productive research and graduate education environment for the discipline and profession? These components might include post docs/research associates, technical and other staff support, research funding, adequate space, equipment, access to literature, etc. In addition, the resources to send graduate students to professional/disciplinary society meetings are key to their success and to the university’s visibility. (I am making the assumption that faculty already attend such meetings).

**Interdisciplinary connections**

Does the unit have established connections that permit and encourage education/training of the graduate degree recipient beyond the confines of the unit? How do you use those connections?

How can they be improved to strengthen your graduate program? This component is based on the premise that many of the problems that will be faced by graduate degree recipients will be between or beyond disciplines. How comfortable and competitive will your graduates be in a diverse global environment?

**THE ACTION PLAN**

We suggest that the action plan that is the result of the external review committee’s report should be strategically focused. Four or five pages should suffice.

Plans that are as explicit as possible that address the areas needing improvement for the next 5 years (or 10 years depending on the discipline) should be provided.

What is the future of your discipline? The growth areas? Will your department be a part of this future? What would you need to do to attract 2-3 of the 50 very best graduate students in the U.S. or the world?

How will you evaluate your progress? What specific metrics will you use to gauge your success?
## Program Summary

**Program Name and Degree (please fill out separate form for each degree):**

**Program Website:**

**NRC Ranking (if applicable):**

**Purpose:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Applications (Fall)</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,101</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Accepted</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of New Enrolled FT</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of New Enrolled PT</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Scores for Fall Entering Class</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GMAT Scores for Fall Entering Class</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Other Scores for Fall Entering Class (if relevant; specify test)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Undergraduate GPA for Fall Entering Class</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Graduate GPA for Fall Entering Class (if applicable)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Financially Registered Enrolled Students</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of TAs</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of RAs</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of GAs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of FE (Fellowships)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of TRs (Trainees)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of WV (Waivers only but none of above, e.g., dissertation only with waiver)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Traineeships from Florida (FL)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Assistantships supported by Graduate School (GR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Stipends Only</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Amount of &quot;Typical Stipend&quot; for First-Year Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students Funded on Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Degrees Granted (Summer B- Summer A)</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Completion (in years, one decimal place)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Students Passing License or Certification Exams (Year of Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Status for the past 5 years</td>
<td>Enter placement information in the Degrees Awarded Data tab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
<td>Semester Degree Awarded (e.g., Fall 2006)</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Current Employer</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table I

**Faculty Summary**  
Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree/Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank/ Appointment Date</th>
<th>Chair Departmental Thesis (T) Disserta. (D) Committee</th>
<th>Member Departmental Thesis (T) Disserta. (D) Committee</th>
<th>Member Extra Departmental Thesis (T) Disserta. (D) Committee</th>
<th>Notable Additions</th>
<th>Full-length Refereed (only) Publications</th>
<th>Extra-mural (funded) Grants &amp; Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poe, C.</td>
<td>Ph. D. 1964</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Professor 1964</td>
<td>1 (T) 1 (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edited 1 Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADUATE SCHOOL PROGRAM REVIEW
ROLES OF INTERNAL COMMITTEE

1. To review the self-study report and to indicate where information is missing. Your feedback will be provided to the program before the external review document is sent to the external reviewers. The internal committee chair will send me a memo that will be forwarded to the Graduate Program Director.

2. To meet with the external reviewers at the end of the second day and seek their impressions of the program and ask questions of them. Based upon your reading of the self-study and input from the external committee, you will write an internal review document (about 3 to 5 pages) addressed to the Graduate Council.

3. You will present the program review to the graduate council for discussion. I serve as a facilitator of this discussion. I have expanded the role of the Graduate Council to be more involved with the strategic planning for graduate education. They will ask questions of clarification of you and then a determination is made in Executive Session whether the program review is ready to be forwarded to the Provost. After the Provost reviews the complete review, it is then forwarded by the program to the Faculty Senate and the Graduate School sends one to the SACs accreditation office. Thus, these program reviews are essential to strategic planning, faculty governance, as well as supporting the accreditation process as documentation of strategic planning by graduate programs.
A Sampling from Previous Internal Committee Memos

The Internal Committee can comment on each section of the document such as those shown below:

General comments
This is a clearly and carefully prepared report. It provides a great deal of detail, at some points perhaps too much (e.g. Table in p. 8 providing components and cost of Audio Visual equipment). It is well-organized and precise.

Program rationale
Why is important to have a GRADUATE program in ________?

What are the advantages for the institution (strategic guidelines: revenue-generating, faculty research-assisting, or reputation-enhancing?) What are the advantages of offering a PhD program?

What are the advantages for South Florida, for the country to have this program at UM?

Are we satisfied with the program we have? Do we want to improve it? At this point it may be helpful to declare 3 peer institutions we feel we compare to, and 3 aspirational comparison schools, if we want to upgrade the program. These comparisons can and should be used throughout the report to compare values (e.g. number of students, number of faculty, funding levels, publications/student, average GREs, attrition rates, etc), whenever possible.

Information
Some of the following information is missing or difficult to grasp. The information could be added in additional tables, perhaps in Appendix form:

Clarify attrition rates (if possible indicate causes).

What is the number of students not passing Qualifying examinations? %?

The following information needs to be included:
- GRE Statistics
- Student Fellowships: any aside UM fellowships?
- Transfer students

Strategic plan
The goal is to more than double the graduate enrollment. While the case is made that the job market is strong, the arguments for expansion could be a bit stronger. In other words, if I were going to double ______ graduates, why would UM’s program be the one to provide these new graduates? This may be a good time to bring back the comparison schools mentioned in the introduction, and address the questions of where we are, where we would like to be, and above all, why.

Or the Internal Committee memo could just be bullets:
- Page 33, Section 5a: More information needs to be provided about how a research assistantship differs from a fellowship (i.e., salary, hours).
- Page 36, Section 5d: How can this section report on teaching assistants when on page 34 it was stated that there are none?
- Page 48, Section 6a: Exactly what secretarial support is needed and used by the Ph.D. program? Exactly how much student travel has been funded by the department during the past five years?
Sample Schedule

(Please note there are slight variations to this plan for Medical and RSMAS campuses)

*GPD = Graduate Program Director or Asst/Assoc Dean as applicable

This schedule should be set up and all relevant parties notified as soon as the visitation dates with the external committee are known.

The program internal document must be reviewed by the UM internal committee and feedback given to the program director or dean before the document goes to the external committee. The final internal document for review by the external committee should be submitted to them 30 days prior to their visit.

Day 1 –
Arrive in Miami and check into hotel by 5 pm. Dinner with external reviewers and Dean of the School receiving program review (expense paid by department).

Day 2 –
8:30-9:30 am  Breakfast at hotel with Dean of the Graduate School (expense paid by the Graduate School)

9:30 am A program faculty member picks up External Reviewers and brings them to campus from hotel

11:00 am Program Faculty meets with External Reviewers

12:30 pm Lunch with select Program Faculty not in previous meeting (expense paid by the department)

2:00 pm Program Faculty meet with External Reviewers

5:00 pm External Reviewers meet in 2 sessions, first with 1st & 2nd year students and then a separate session for the 3rd and 4th years and other advanced students (refreshments paid by the department). The second meeting can be done as an informal luncheon with the advanced students on the second day, if preferred.

7:00 pm Dinner with External Reviewers and GPD or Dean (expense paid by the department)

Day 3 –
8:30-9:30 am Breakfast - External Reviewers only (expense submitted to the Graduate School for reimbursement)

9:30 am Program faculty member picks up External Reviewers and brings them to campus (along with their luggage if they are leaving directly for the airport after the exit meetings)

10:30-12:30 Meetings as decided between External Reviewers and Program Faculty

12:30-2:00 pm Lunch with select Program Faculty (expense covered by the Department)

2:00 pm External Reviewers exit meeting with Dean of School and/or GPD

3:00 pm  External Reviewers meet with Provost and Dean Blake
4:00-5:00 pm  *Debriefing meeting with Dean Blake and External Reviewers and Internal Sub-Committee Members*

6:00 pm  External Reviewers dinner on their own or return to airport (Expense reimbursed by the Graduate School)

**Note:** Items in *Italics* are set up by the Graduate School. All others are coordinated in the department.

The dean of the school MUST meet with the external reviewers at some point in the schedule. A tour of the facilities should be included in the visit.

The transportation, lodging and honorarium for the External Reviewers are paid by the Graduate School. Meals with the Department, refreshments for student meetings, etc. are covered by the Department.

The report from the External Reviewers is submitted directly to Dean Blake at the Graduate School
### Mission Statement/Program Objectives

Please insert program mission/objectives as stated on your Program Assessment

### Definition & Assessment of Intended Outcomes

| Outcome 1: | Please insert outcomes (number will vary) as stated on Program Assessment |
| Assessment Measure 1: | Please insert identified methods (number will vary) for considering the program’s level of attainment of outcomes according to program assessment. |
| Assessment Measure 2: |

| Outcome 2: |
| Assessment Measure 1: |
| Assessment Measure 2: |

### Findings

- Please structure your response to this section according to your defined outcomes and, using the results from your assessment, provide evidence (i.e., quantitative and/or qualitative) of the level of attainment for each outcome.
- How did your faculty review the assessment results to draw conclusions about the program objectives?
- Please describe the strengths and concerns of your program identified from the assessment results? (Include supporting documents, only when applicable, as attachment to this report.)

### Discussions

- What changes will be made to address concerns within the program?
- What course of action (including timelines) are you implementing to make identified changes?
- Are there any ways that your program assessment plan could be improved in the future?