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Introduction to Program Review

Periodic review of each University of Oregon degree program is essential to maintaining excellence and for effective long-range planning. This review process is a positive approach to academic assessment, promoting each unit’s desire to develop, evolve, and reaffirm its commitment to excellence.

Academic program review is a primary means to maintain and improve program quality. As a result, academic units can realize many benefits from a thorough program review. Some of the most positive outcomes include:

1. An examination of the quality and value of the unit’s academic programs by the faculty, students, and administrators.
2. An evaluation, and perhaps revision, of objectives for the teaching, research, and service missions of the academic program as they relate to the University’s academic mission and strategic priorities.
3. A clarification of program goals, strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities.
4. An improved source of information to help guide decisions on strategic priorities and associated resources.

Policy

As delegated by the Provost, the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs is responsible for coordinating the necessary periodic reviews of degree programs, is the main point of contact for programs being reviewed, and has responsibility for oversight and implementation of the Program Review process.

The University will review each of its programs every ten years (more frequently, if required), and report results to the University community. Please consult the Office of Academic Affairs for a current Program Review schedule.

Accreditation and Program Review

Accreditation and program review are different. Accreditation, an external review process, typically measures minimum standards of performance, while program review, an internal process, focuses on identifying goals and objectives and assisting a program to reach its greatest potential. Because these reviews respond to different questions and concerns, an accreditation self-study may comprise part but not all of a program review self-study.
Outline of UO Program Review Process

1. Academic Affairs meets with deans and associate deans to discuss upcoming reviews
2. Dean notifies department or unit heads
3. Academic Affairs meets with unit heads regarding upcoming program review
4. Unit prepares list of possible reviewers
5. School/College and unit provide possible dates for on-site visit
6. Unit prepares self-study
   a. Ensure that NTTF are adequately represented in the self-study
   b. Address issues surrounding equity and inclusion
   c. Identify comparators (two departments, one larger unit)
   d. Incorporate data from the following sources:
      Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) or National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
      Library
      Institutional Research (IR)
      Graduate School data
      Academic Analytics
   e. Include IR data in appendices
   f. Compile self-study and appendices into one PDF document and shared using Dropbox
7. Academic Affairs contacts External Review Committee (ERC), arranges lodging, transportation
8. Academic Affairs schedules introductory and exit meetings for site visit
9. Department schedules remaining meetings for site visit
   (NOTE: Please keep dean and associate dean updated on meeting dates and times)
10. Academic Affairs sends self-study to reviewers four weeks in advance of site visit
11. Site visit takes place
12. Reviewers submit report; Academic Affairs reviews and distributes
13. Introductory/Exit meeting participants and department or unit head provide comments on ERC report
14. Dean or associate dean submits Dean’s Response and Implementation Plan
15. Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, unit head, and dean or associate dean meet to discuss Dean’s Response and Implementation Plan
**Procedure Overview**

**Timeline:**

The program review process typically requires a full year, with the site visit through final documentation requiring six months to complete. The department prepares the self-study, to be distributed four weeks before the site visit. The External Review Committee (ERC) conducts the site visit and prepares its written report within one month following the site visit. The Response to the ERC is drafted by the dean and or his or her designees and submitted to the Senior Vice Provost.

**Planning Phase:**

Academic units shall be notified by the Senior Vice Provost approximately six months in advance of the scheduled program review.

The Senior Vice Provost shall consult with the appropriate dean(s) in advance of the scheduled review to discuss issues relevant to the review of academic and non-instructional aspects of the unit.

The Senior Vice Provost and the dean shall then meet with the head or director of the unit scheduled for review to discuss the review and relevant issues. At this meeting, a list of potential external reviewers is discussed (see "Guidelines for Selection of Reviewers"). The Senior Vice Provost will make the initial contact with these individuals to recruit them as reviewers.

**Self-Study Preparation:**

Once the Senior Vice Provost, dean, and the head of the unit have discussed the initiation of a review, the unit begins to prepare a self-study document about the degree program under review.

A format for the self-study consistent with University requirements is provided to the unit by the Senior Vice Provost (see “Guidelines for Units under Review”). Data to be included in the self-study are provided by the Office of Institutional Research, the UO Knight Library, the Office of Research and Innovation, Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) or the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the UO Graduate School. The Senior Vice Provost will assist in delivering these data to the unit head under review.

The completed self-study is submitted in one PDF document by the unit to the dean, who then transmits the document to the Senior Vice Provost. The Senior Vice Provost will forward all pertinent materials to the ERC members.
Site Visit:

During the two-day site visit the External Review Committee (ERC) initially meets with representatives from Academic Affairs, the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, and the relevant dean's office. Subsequently, the ERC meets with dean(s), unit head, faculty, staff, students, and other individuals that are associated with the program.

External Review Committee (ERC) Report:

Within one month of the visit, the ERC submits a written assessment and recommendations regarding the program to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who then transmits the report to the introductory and exit meeting participants, and the department or unit head. The introductory meeting participants will each augment the report with comments regarding the undergraduate and graduate programs, and research component of the report. These comments are due within two weeks of receipt of the ERC report and are forwarded to the Senior Vice Provost. The Senior Vice Provost will then forward the comments to the dean and department or unit head for analysis, review, and commentary.

Dean's Response and Implementation Plan:

Next, the dean prepares a “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan,” which is submitted to the Senior Vice Provost. After receiving the “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan,” the Senior Vice Provost meets with the dean and department or unit head to discuss the program review reports.
Program Review
Tentative Timeline

Spring/Summer prior to review
- Academic Affairs hosts planning meeting (#1) with deans and associate deans.
- Academic Affairs hosts planning meeting (#2) with associate deans and unit heads.
- Unit under review submits list of potential reviewers to Academic Affairs.
- Dean consults with Academic Affairs regarding issues relevant to the review.

Summer/Fall prior to review
- Unit under review starts work on self-study and chooses comparators for Institutional Research (IR) data, including Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) or National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data; Academic Analytics data, Library data, Graduate School data; include issues surrounding equity and inclusion, NTTF, grad/undergrad students.
- Academic Affairs requests data for departments from IR, including SERU or NSSE data; Academic Analytics data, Library data, Graduate School data.
- Academic Affairs hosts planning meeting (#3) with department or unit heads and support staff.
- Academic Affairs contacts reviewers, schedules dates of site visit, and arranges and pays for travel and accommodations.

Six weeks prior to review
- Unit under review creates itinerary for site visit and forwards it to Academic Affairs for review.

Four weeks prior to review
- Unit under review sends self-study as one pdf to dean.
- Dean sends self-study as one pdf to Academic Affairs.
- Academic Affairs shares self-study with reviewers, UO intro/exit meeting team.

During site visit
- Unit under review hosts external reviewers.
- Dean attends intro/exit meetings and provides guidance to reviewers.

After site visit
- Academic Affairs forwards external report to unit head, dean, intro/exit meeting participants for comment. Responses from all are due to Academic Affairs within two weeks of document receipt.
- Senior Vice Provost and Dean meet to discuss report and comments.
- Dean writes Dean’s Response and Implementation Plan.
Guidelines for Units Under Review

The following guidelines were developed to assist units involved in program review. Please feel free to contact the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs whenever you have questions. Reviews should be viewed positively, and as an opportunity for the department or unit to conduct healthy self-examination, affirm current practices, propose changes, and receive constructive criticism.

Self-Study

The self-study document (see “Self-Study Format”) is the unit’s main opportunity to provide background information about the department or unit to the External Review Committee, the dean, and the Senior Vice Provost. It should describe the status of the program clearly and concisely in terms that permit review by non-specialists.

Site Visit

In order to make the most efficient use of the site visit, the department or unit head should communicate with the internal participants (identified in the following paragraph) in advance of the site visit to clarify important issues, if necessary. The department or unit should be prepared to provide any additional information requested by the External Review Committee (ERC) beyond the self-study.

The department or unit head is responsible for coordinating the site visit schedule. The ERC will meet with faculty, staff, and students who are representative of the program under review, and with campus administrators (see section entitled "Sample Schedule for Site Visit"). The department or unit head should review the proposed schedule with the dean and with the Senior Vice Provost. Remember, the Senior Vice Provost will make first contact with potential reviewers.

The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for coordinating travel and lodging accommodations for the ERC members. Each visiting reviewer will receive an honorarium, distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs will also cover the travel, lodging, and meal expenses for the external reviewers.

External Review Committee (ERC) Report and Dean's Response and Implementation Plan

Following receipt of the final augmented External Review Committee report (see “Procedure Overview”), the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will review the report and send it to the dean, associate dean, unit head, and introductory meeting participants. The department or unit head and introductory meeting participants are invited to make comments on any content in the ERC report. The Office of Academic Affairs will forward all comments to the dean or associate dean.

The dean or associate dean will prepare a “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan,” which will be submitted to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, dean or associate dean, and unit head, will meet to discuss the “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan.”
Guidelines for Selection of Reviewers

A list of six to ten suggested external reviewers, ranked in order of preference, is submitted to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs by the head of the department or unit being reviewed. The External Review Committee will consist of three reviewers. Suggested reviewers may be chosen from different areas within the discipline in order to cover as many of the activities of the unit as possible. If there are multiple areas within a discipline, the unit should submit the names of suggested reviewers in corresponding groups. The potential reviewers in each group should be considered as possible substitutes for each other but may not be exchangeable between groups. The details of how the reviewers might best be grouped are a matter of professional judgment for those in the discipline. The long-term viability of the unit and the credibility of the review will be enhanced by identifying thoughtful, knowledgeable, and objective external reviewers. Consideration of geographic diversity, as well as gender and ethnic diversity, should be taken when preparing the list of reviewers. Department or unit heads are encouraged to consult with their faculty to assist in compilation of the list.

External reviewers should be:

- Nationally recognized experts in the academic field
- Respected peers with expertise in the areas of specialization central to the unit
- Experienced academics who understand the operation of a major research university
- Able to evaluate the unit’s strengths and weaknesses
- Able to assess the performance of the unit in relation to comparator institutions
- Able to assess the unit’s operations, plans for growth and development, and faculty accomplishments

For each individual nominated to serve as an external reviewer, the unit must provide to the Senior Vice Provost the following information:

- Name
- Current Address
- Email Address
- Phone Number
- Brief statement of individual’s academic background and accomplishments
- Any previous contacts with the unit or its faculty

The cooperation of the unit in providing this information in a timely manner will materially aid the difficult task of assembling a first-rate external committee and producing a useful and meaningful program review.

In selecting the list of potential external reviewers, it is preferable to avoid former mentors or close personal friends of faculty members, former University of Oregon employees, and individuals who have applied for or are likely to apply for a position at UO. It is similarly preferable to avoid individuals from institutions substantially different in character from the University of Oregon.

The names submitted by the unit are studied by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who will use the list as a guide, but may select reviewers not on the list. The Senior Vice Provost will then issue invitations to the selected potential reviewers. In the event of declinations, alternates on the list will be contacted until the roster of reviewers is complete.
Sample Schedule for Site Visit

The introductory and exit interview meetings will be scheduled as indicated below. The Office of Academic Affairs will provide the times for these two meetings prior to the unit completing the remainder of the agenda. The order of all other meetings and events will vary depending on the availability of the different individuals and groups and the time frame and criteria determined by the hosting unit.

Day One

1. Introductory meeting with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and representatives from Research and Innovation, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, and the relevant dean's Office.

2. Meet with dean of the college or school to whom the unit reports.

3. Meet with head of the unit under review.

4. Meet with individual members or small groups of the department or unit's faculty, and affiliated faculty from across campus.

5. Tour facilities.

Day Two

1. Meet with individual members or small groups of the department or unit's faculty, including both tenure-related and non-tenure-related.

2. If appropriate, meet with any other administrative offices (e.g., the Office of Research and Innovation, Libraries, or museums).

3. Meet with graduate students.

4. Meet with undergraduate students.

5. Meet with unit administrative/support staff.

6. Final interview with dean, associate dean, and department or unit head.

7. One hour for reviewers to confer and prepare for exit meeting.

8. Exit meeting with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and representatives from Research and Innovation, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, and the relevant dean's office.
**Self-Study Format**

Although programs engage in continual self-assessment and review of their work, periodic program reviews are designed to contextualize a program’s academic structure and performance. The goal of program review is to gain a broader perspective regarding a program’s profile, such as the following:

- mission, goals, and objectives
- quality and breadth of instruction, research, and public service
- preparation of students in the discipline
- role within the University and effectiveness in fulfilling that role
- utilization of resources and resource requirements

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Departments or other degree-granting units should follow this format in preparing self-study documents for periodic reviews of degree programs. The information submitted should be completed in narrative or table form as applicable. We suggest a total length of approximately thirty pages for the document, excluding appendices and faculty curriculum vitae.

One electronic copy (PDF) of the unit’s self-study report should be sent by the department or unit head to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. It will be distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs to each member of the External Review Committee and to the participants of the site visit introductory meeting.

In preparing the self-study report, units are asked to reflect upon objective data and to engage in thoughtful reflection and analysis on past performance, goals, and future plans.

The self-study report should include each of the following elements:

I. **OVERVIEW: DESCRIPTION AND ORGANIZATION**

   A. **Degree Offerings and Accreditation and/or Certification** - Describe which degrees are granted by the unit. Give the exact title of these degrees (e.g., Bachelor of Arts, Master of Science, Doctor of Musical Arts, etc.). List any separate curricular programs and/or specialties within the unit, as well as any official certificate programs. If any of the unit’s programs are accredited, provide the name of the accrediting agency, the date granted, and the date of the next anticipated review. If accreditation has been denied or has not yet been attained, describe the current status of the program in this regard.

   B. **Research, Performance, and Creative Activity** - What is the research or creative profile of the department or unit? What are the areas of strength? How does the research or creative production of the unit intersect with other programs, units, and fields?

   C. **Role within the University** - Units have a variety of roles and responsibilities within the university, and may contribute to the mission and strategic priorities of the university more directly in some areas than in others (e.g., undergraduate education or graduate education; basic or applied research; enriching the lives of Oregonians; international awareness, etc.). What are the unit’s perceptions of the University’s strategic priorities and how does the unit contribute to fulfilling those priorities? Identify specific ways in which the unit contributes to the mission of the UO. In both cases, focus on what the unit does particularly well or what qualities you believe are unique or distinctive.
D. **Assessment Plan** - An essential element of the self-study report is the unit’s academic assessment plan, created by the unit and clearly presenting its assessment practices with respect to academic programming. These practices should include defined methods for measuring success and/or other outcomes, as well as plans for “closing the loop” – i.e., for using the results of the assessment effort to inform modification or revision of the academic program. This procedure is part of a university-wide effort to gather information for institutional assessment and review processes, and is also consistent with the recognition that assessment can and does enhance academic efforts. Considerable latitude is permissible and expected in these assessment statements. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs is available for consultation regarding unit-specific models and/or templates if desired. Describe what the graduates of your programs should know and be able to do when they leave the university. How does the unit assess the extent to which students have met these expectations? Include a discussion of any department-specific indicators that have been developed (e.g., exit exams or blind reading of senior essays) as well as university-provided indicators of the quality of the graduates. To what degree have graduate students published research (or presented creative work) before graduation?

E. **Equity and Inclusion Initiatives** - Address issues surrounding equity and inclusion as they relate to your faculty, staff, and students. Describe any programs and efforts undertaken by your unit to recruit and retain faculty, staff and students from underrepresented populations.

F. **International Initiatives** - Discuss any initiatives that focus on international research and service, and/or international students or provide international experiences for enrolled students.

G. **Administrative Structure** - Locate the unit within the structures of the University (e.g., English Department, Humanities Division, College of Arts and Sciences). Describe any important formal and informal relationships the unit has with other departments, institutes, centers, or other units within the university. Briefly describe the administrative structure(s) of the unit. Summarize the structure and function of major committees. Describe and explain any significant changes in these structures or relationships that have occurred over the last five years. Describe any planned or desired changes in these structures or relationships.

H. **Funding and Budget** - Using the data provided, briefly summarize the unit’s budget including sources of funds, expenditures relative to student credit hours and faculty FTE, and grant and contract funding. Comment on recent trends in these figures.

I. **Infrastructure** - Describe and comment on the facilities dedicated to the unit, the types and amounts of technical support, and the types and amounts of administrative support. Describe any significant changes in these over the last five years. Describe any planned or desired changes in these elements. What are the most pressing needs?

J. **Strategic Plan** - What is the plan to reach short, intermediate, and long-range goals of the unit?

K. **Special Concerns (Optional)** - Describe any particular issues or concerns that the unit wishes the review committee to address or give special attention.
II. CURRICULAR PROGRAMS

This section should describe in detail the curricular programs within the unit. If a unit offers multiple degree programs at either the undergraduate or graduate level, the description of these programs may be presented separately or together. However, units should note and justify the method of presentation.

A. Undergraduate Programs

1. Description and Rationale for the Curriculum

1.1 Degree Programs and Options for Majors - Describe the bachelor's degree program options including the total number of required credits and credit distribution among any options. If more than one option or specialization track is available, list each option or track and the curricula separately (use attached Appendix format). Briefly explain the rationale for the structure of the major requirements, including any prerequisites or proficiency requirements. Indicate the scheduled frequency at which courses within the curriculum are offered. What is the typical size of classes within each segment of the curriculum? Describe any opportunities for independent study, research, honors programs, international experiences, and/or participatory learning experiences that exist within the major curriculum.

1.2 General and Service Education - What roles, if any, do general education offerings and service courses to other disciplines play in the curriculum? Describe the general education and/or service course offerings and briefly explain the rationale for these courses. Describe any recent trends in these types of offerings, including enrollment trends.

1.3 Interdisciplinary & International Components - Describe the extent of the unit's participation in interdisciplinary courses or curricula and the rationale for the development of and participation in these courses or curricula. Describe any components that provide international experiences for majors.

1.4 Use of Technology - Describe the extent to which technology is being used to deliver the undergraduate curriculum. Comment on the use of class management technology (e.g., Canvas) in the undergraduate curriculum. Identify all courses that are delivered predominantly or exclusively via distributed learning. Discuss any plans to increase or decrease the use of technology and/or distributed learning.

2. Student Characteristics

2.1 Number of Students and Enrollment Patterns - Discuss trends over the past 10 years (or since the time of the last review) in the numbers of students within the program and degree options. Discuss enrollment patterns such as enrollment at different levels of the curriculum, enrollment in individualized study and other specialized courses, and whether or not students are customarily enrolled for summer as well as other quarters.

2.2 Demographic Data - Describe the demographic characteristics (including gender, age, race/ethnicity) of undergraduate majors. Highlight any characteristics in which majors in the area may differ from the University as a whole (e.g., higher percentage of non-traditional students).
2.3 **Academic Quality** - Discuss data available on the academic characteristics of majors within the program including entry test scores (e.g., SAT), average entering GPA, GPA at graduation, and if applicable, placement test scores (or comparable metrics for performance-based disciplines). Compare these characteristics to those of closely-related departments, and the university as a whole. Also include a discussion of trends over time and any other indicators collected by the unit.

2.4 **Graduation Patterns** - Describe trends in the number of degrees and the length of time required for degree completion since the time of the last review or within the last 10 years. What are the approximate attrition rates from the major? Compare these indicators to those in closely-related departments and the University as a whole.

1. **Academic and Support Staffing**

3.1 **Teaching** - What proportion of courses at each level (e.g., lower division, upper division) are taught by tenure track faculty, career non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), adjunct NTTF, and graduate teaching fellows? If non-instructional staff members have responsibility for delivering some elements of the curriculum, describe the nature of their involvement and the rationale for this practice. How are decisions regarding course assignments made?

3.2 **Advising and Other Services** - Who provides academic advising to undergraduates? Do faculty members or other staff serve in additional roles, such as mentor, internship supervisor, other? How are decisions made regarding the assignment of academic advisors and service in other roles?

2. **Evaluation and Reflection**

4.1 **Quality of the Undergraduate Curriculum** - What procedures does the unit use to evaluate a) the quality of undergraduate courses and degree programs; b) the progress of individual students toward a degree; and c) the long-term effectiveness of the program? Describe the results of these assessments. How satisfied is the unit with the breadth and quality of the various parts of the curriculum? Describe the ways in which issues such as the development of critical thinking, written and spoken communications skills, cross-cultural awareness, and/or individual-based research and learning have been addressed. Discuss how grade inflation has been dealt with in the unit’s undergraduate courses. Highlight any areas of specialization and/or features of the unit’s undergraduate programs that make them distinctive or unique.

4.2 **Curriculum Changes** - What significant changes have taken place in course offerings and degree programs over the past five years? Explain the rationale for these changes and the relation, if any, to recent trends and developments in the field, to ongoing assessments of student learning and the curriculum, and/or to trends in the placement of graduates. Are there desirable changes in the undergraduate curriculum that have not been accomplished? What has prevented the implementation of these changes? What changes, if any, are being considered or planned for the next 3-5 years?
4.3 **Quality of Instruction and Advising** - What procedures are used to judge the quality and effectiveness of instruction and academic advising within the undergraduate curriculum (e.g., course evaluations, classroom visitations, post-graduation surveys of students, etc.)? Discuss the results of these assessments. Comment on how this unit compares to similar departments and the University as a whole.

4.4 **Student Satisfaction** - What steps does the unit take to assess graduating students’ perceptions of the quality of their experiences? What are the results of these assessments? Have any changes been made in the undergraduate program based on these measures? Provide an analysis of the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) or the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data.

4.5 **Postgraduate Placements** - Describe any data available on the postgraduate academic and career placement of students. Are there specific trends in these placements? Does the unit assist in the placement of graduates? To what extent are alumni, visiting committees, or advisory boards involved in evaluating the quality of the unit’s graduates in the work place?

**B. Graduate Programs**

1. **Description and Rationale for the Curriculum**

   1.1 **Master’s** - Describe the master’s degree curriculum including the total number of required credits and credit distribution among various fields or subfields. If more than one option or specialization track is available, list the options or tracks and the curricula separately (use attached Appendix A format for this purpose). Note any required research experience (or performance or creative activity) such as a thesis, terminal project, internship, or other experiences outside the classroom. Indicate any associated professional certification or licensure requirements. Include any additional information concerning curricula emphasis which would aid in characterizing this program as practice or research oriented. If there is substantial dependence on some other unit or program, comment on this relationship. Finally, explain the rationale for the structure and sequence of the curriculum for the master’s degree, including any prerequisites or proficiency requirements.

   1.2 **Doctoral** - Describe the doctoral curriculum, including the total number of required credits and credit distribution among various fields or subfields. If more than one option or specialization is available, list the options or tracks and the curricula separately (use attached Appendix A). Indicate whether the master’s degree is usually completed before proceeding to the doctoral degree program and explain any differences in requirements between students entering with or without a master’s degree. Explain the rationale for the structure and sequence of the doctoral curriculum, including any prerequisites or proficiency requirements. Describe all requirements for advancement to candidacy (e.g., written examinations, oral examinations, required papers, proposals), including recommended or required deadlines for completing each component.
1.3 Instructional Relationships to Other Programs - Describe how graduate instruction and research, performance, and/or creative activity in this unit relate to other programs, such as undergraduate, graduate, professional, postdoctoral, within the unit, in other University units, with other OUS institutions, or with external partners. What is the rationale for these relationships? Identify other programs where students frequently take minor fields of study or other program options in the unit. Describe the extent of the unit's participation in interdisciplinary programs at the graduate level. List any courses in the program that are requirements, prerequisites, or frequently recommended for students in graduate degree programs outside this unit.

1.4 Research Participation - What types of formalized research training do graduate students receive before they begin work on their theses or dissertations? Describe the nature and extent of this training, how it differs for master's and doctoral students, and the rationale for the specific nature of this training. If any of these training experiences are not a part of the regular curriculum, how are these experiences supported and how are students selected for them?

1.5 Teaching Preparation - How is the development of graduate students' teaching abilities addressed by the program? What types of teaching experiences do graduate students have during their program, and what percentage of the students get those experiences? Describe any awards or other types of support for graduate students' teaching.

1.6 Funding - Describe the stipend support packages that are available annually for graduate students and the number of each type of appointment (e.g., teaching and research assistantships, fellowships, and traineeships). Describe the procedures used to allocate the support and any information as to how the level and type of student support compares to that offered by closely-related units, the university as a whole, and comparator universities. Discuss how current funding affects the recruitment of graduate students to your program.

2. Student Characteristics

2.1 Number of Students and Enrollment Patterns - Discuss trends over the past 10 years (or since the time of the last review) in the numbers of students within each segment of the graduate programs. Discuss enrollment patterns such as enrollment at different levels of the curriculum, full-time and part-time ratios, and the extent to which students are customarily enrolled for summer as well as other quarters. What is the optimal size of the graduate program at each level (Master's, Doctoral)? If the current program differs from the optimal size, how does the unit plan to move toward that goal?

2.2 Demographic Data - Describe the demographic characteristics (including age, gender, race/ethnicity) of graduate students. Highlight any characteristics on which graduate students in this unit may differ from graduate students in other units within the University.
2.3 **Academic Quality** - Discuss data available on the academic characteristics of graduate students applying to, and accepted by, graduate programs in this unit (separate these data by Master's vs. Doctoral if appropriate). Include information on criteria used to make admissions decisions (e.g., entry test scores, average entering G.P.A., placement test scores, portfolio, audition). Include data on applicants, students offered admission, and those who accept, including measures of selectivity and yield. Compare these characteristics to those of similar departments and the university as a whole. Also include a discussion of trends over time and any additional indicators collected by the unit.

2.4 **Graduation Patterns** - Describe trends in the number of degrees and the length of time required for degree completion at each level of the graduate program since the time of the last review or within the last 10 years. What are the approximate attrition rates from each portion of the graduate program? For the doctoral program, what percentage of students successfully reached advancement within four years, and what percentage completed the degree within seven years? Compare these indicators to those for closely-related departments and the University as a whole.

3. **Academic and Support Staffing**

3.1 **Teaching** - What proportions of courses in each segment of the graduate program are taught by each of the following: tenure track faculty, career NTTF, or adjunct NTTF? How do these proportions compare to those for other similar units within the university? If non-instructional staff share responsibility for delivering the curriculum, describe the nature of their role and the rationale for this practice. If graduate teaching assistants are involved in teaching any graduate courses, describe the nature of that involvement and the rationale for this practice. How are decisions regarding course assignments made?

3.2 **Advising and Mentoring** - How are advisors assigned to graduate students and what is the advisor/advisee ratio at the graduate level? What is the role of the advisor in the unit? Describe the nature of any workload adjustments that the unit makes for faculty service on dissertation or thesis committees.

4. **Evaluation and Reflection**

Units should note at the beginning of this section whether to present assessments of master's and doctoral programs together or separately.

4.1 **Quality of the Graduate Curriculum** - What procedures are used to evaluate a) the quality of graduate courses, mentorship, and advising; b) the progress of individual students toward a degree; and c) the long-term effectiveness of the program? Describe the results of these assessments. How satisfied is the unit with the breadth and quality of the various parts of the graduate curriculum? What proportion of the graduate curriculum consists of courses that contain only graduate students (i.e., 600 level)? If a significant proportion of courses are not graduate-only (i.e., 400/500 courses), describe what requirements are added to these courses to assure that graduate level training is taking place. Describe the ways in which issues such as time toward degree, attrition, involvement in research, and job placement have been addressed. Identify any areas of specialization and/or features of the unit's graduate programs that make them distinctive or unique.
4.2 Curriculum Changes - What significant changes have taken place in the graduate program(s) over the past five years? Explain the rationale for these changes and the relation, if any, to recent trends and developments in the field, to ongoing assessments of student learning and the curriculum, and/or to trends in the placement of graduates. Are there desirable changes in the graduate curriculum that have not been accomplished? What has prevented the implementation of these changes? What changes, if any, are being considered or planned for the next 3-5 years.

4.3 Quality of Instruction and Advising - What procedures are used to judge the quality of instruction and academic advising within the graduate curriculum? Discuss the results of these assessments.

4.4 Student Satisfaction - How satisfied are graduating students with the quality of their experiences? How do these measures compare with data from similar units and from the university as a whole?

4.5 Postgraduate Placements - Provide data on the placement of graduate students over the last five years. How does the unit assist in the placement of its graduates? To what extent are alumni, visiting committees, or advisory boards involved in evaluating the quality of graduates in the work place?

III. FACULTY

This section should describe and reflect on the quality and adequacy of academic staffing within the unit. As an attachment to the self-study narrative, units must provide an alphabetic list of faculty members, their ranks, and the number of master's and doctoral committees they have headed and/or served on during the past five years. Current curriculum vitae (CVs) for each tenure track faculty member should follow the text and all appendices. Also include CVs for all career NTTF and any currently appointed adjunct NTTF, and any others (e.g., emeriti, participating, or courtesy faculty) who are appointed in the unit. The CVs should be included as a chapter of the PDF self-study document.

A. Numbers and Status

1. Size and Composition - Describe the size and composition of the unit’s faculty in terms of ranks and areas of specialization within the discipline. To what extent are non-tenure track faculty (e.g., visiting, career NTTF, adjunct NTTF) a part of the unit’s programs? Do faculty members from other university units serve important roles within the unit? What is the typical duration of involvement for non-tenure track faculty in their roles? Describe the rationale for the unit’s staffing plan.

2. Recruitment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion - Describe the rates at which the unit has successfully recruited its top choices for new faculty over the last 10 years (or since the last review). Where have new faculty received their training and/or been employed prior to coming to the UO? Describe the unit’s record of retaining faculty, and discuss any plans or strategies for continuing or improving on this record. Provide data on the success rates (successful vs. tried, and time to promotion) for junior faculty receiving tenure and/or tenure and promotion, as well as the rates for faculty being promoted to full professor.
3. **Equity and Inclusion** - How do the proportions of underrepresented groups on the unit’s faculty compare to the University as a whole, comparator institutions, and the field nationwide. What specific plans and programs does the unit have in place to increase the proportions of traditionally underrepresented groups in the faculty and to support their professional development?

B. **Research and Scholarly Work**

1. **Current Research** - Provide a description of notable and/or unique ongoing research, performance, or creative activity in the unit. Describe major accomplishments in this area over the past five years by faculty and/or graduate students. Provide commentary on Academic Analytics as the data relate to your program. If there are no Academic Analytics data for your program or if you believe the data are not representative, please state this clearly in your self-study. When reviewing Academic Analytics data, consider:
   a. What strengths and weaknesses are indicated by the data?
   b. Programmatically, what is supporting the strengths and contributing to weaknesses?
   c. What can the unit put in place to mitigate weaknesses?
   d. What are the implications for faculty evaluation and mentoring?
   e. What are the implications for faculty hiring and retention?

2. **Interdisciplinary Projects or Programs** - Describe interdisciplinary research projects or programs with other units on campus or with other universities or agencies. How successful is the unit in developing and supporting these types of activities? How important are these kinds of interdisciplinary relationships to faculty and graduate students in the unit? What changes in this area, if any, are being considered or planned for the next 3-5 years?

3. **Funding** - Describe and evaluate the level of internal and external funding for research or performance/creative activity for faculty in the unit. Are the faculty and unit competing effectively for external support? What are the unit’s goals, if any, for internal and external research funding? Use Academic Analytics and IR data as applicable. See items 1a-1e above.

4. **Transfer of Knowledge** - Describe any significant recent research or other scholarly/creative interactions with the private sector which have been developed by the unit or individual faculty members (other than consulting). To what extent are faculty engaged in the knowledge or technology transfer process (e.g., invention disclosures, patents, license agreements, spin-off companies)? Does the unit actively encourage such activities or consider them in evaluations such as tenure and promotion decisions? Are there challenges that influence the unit’s ability to form research or creative partnerships with the private sector (e.g., conflict of interest policy, state law, intellectual property rights)?

C. **Teaching**

1. **Teaching Load and Distribution** - Describe how the teaching loads of faculty within the unit are determined, including the number and level of courses. Does the pattern of teaching assignments differ among members of the unit and if so, what are those differences and what is the rationale for this distribution?
2. **Teaching Support** - How does the unit support and reward the development of quality teaching? To what extent have instructional staff used these mechanisms and what have been the results?

D. **Service**

1. **Outreach and Community Service** - Describe the extent to which the unit’s professional expertise is made available to the community, state, and nation through lectures, concerts, service to governmental boards, scientific/professional associations, or any other means. Evaluate the quality of this service and indicate how it contributes to the unit’s instructional and/or research programs.

2. **Continuing or Executive/Professional Education** - To what extent is the unit involved in offering continuing education and professional development courses or programs? List any courses offered through continuing education. Describe any courses or programs designed for professional or executive education. Identify any of these courses or programs that are offered in locations other than the Eugene campus, or via distance technology. Describe any changes that are being considered or planned for the next 3-5 years.

3. **Consulting** - To what extent is the faculty involved in outside consulting work? Provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of this type of work and explain in what ways it contributes to the unit’s instructional and/or research programs.

E. **Evaluation and Review**

1. **Overview** - Provide a brief and candidly descriptive overview of the quality of the research, teaching, and service of faculty in the unit. How do evaluations of faculty teaching compare to similar departments and to the University as a whole? Highlight any areas in which faculty have provided exemplary service to the university, the discipline, and the public. How does the research, performance, or creative activity in the unit compare nationally or internationally to research in the discipline? Describe the criteria by which faculty are evaluated for success in research performance, how these criteria compare to comparator departments, and how well the faculty meet them. Describe any external rankings of the unit. What are the unit’s goals for faculty in the research/creative activity area?

2. **Evaluation Criteria** - Describe how (and how often) the unit evaluates the quality of its faculty in teaching; research, performance, and/or creative activity; and service. How are the results of these evaluations used by the unit? Attach a copy of the standards for promotion and tenure, and for NTTF promotion. Attach a copy of the standards used for post-tenure review. Provide a copy of any other standards or forms used to evaluate teaching, research/performance, or service.

3. **Faculty Development** - What does the unit do to encourage and develop research, performance or creative activity? How well are these incentives working? Describe any deficiencies in facilities and resources that negatively affect the unit’s attempts to reach its research objectives.

4. **Adequacy of Staffing and Resources** - Is the unit staffed adequately to meet the needs of various fields of specialization in the discipline? How will the unit maintain an
appropriate distribution of specializations if available resources remain essentially constant?

IV. SUMMARY

Reflect upon and summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the degree programs and the unit as whole, and the issues that the unit is likely to face in the next five years. Review briefly the unit’s objectives for the next 5-10 years. What changes might help the unit attain these objectives? If changes require resources, identify possible sources. If changes will make resources available, discuss how they would be reallocated.

V. APPENDICES

A. Degree Options and Certificate Programs - Using the format below, please provide a description of each degree option, pathway, specialization, concentration, and/or formally recognized certificate program. Identify each separate option or program as undergraduate, master's or doctoral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option/Certificate:</th>
<th>Descriptive Title</th>
<th>Percentage of Majors in Option / Certificate</th>
<th>Percentage of Faculty (by type) who Teach in Option / Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum for Option/Certificate Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Required or Elective</th>
<th>Offering Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Other Data - This section should be used to present data that have been extracted from the institutional indicators provided by the Office of Institutional Research. (The entire set of data may be provided in Appendix E.)

C. Assessment Plan - Include the latest version of your department or unit’s assessment plan.

D. Faculty CVs - This section should be used to compile current curriculum vitae (CVs) for each tenure related faculty member; non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), including career and adjunct NTTF; and any others (e.g. emeriti, participating, or courtesy faculty) who regularly teach for the unit. The CVs should be included as a chapter in the PDF self-study document.

E. Unit Data from Institutional Research - This appendix should consist of a copy of the entire set of data provided to the unit by the Office of Institutional Research.
Appendices additional to those listed above may be added as appropriate and might include:

- A brief department history since the last review
- The department’s constitution or mission statement
- The department’s diversity report
- *Ad Hoc* or other committee reports
- General duties and responsibility statement
- Student Handbook (Graduate, Undergraduate or both)
- Summary of faculty recruitment, retirements, and resignations

**Guidelines for the Dean's Response and Implementation Plan**

Following receipt of the finalized external reviewer’s report and comments from introductory meeting participants, the “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan” is prepared by the academic dean or associate dean. In preparing this document, the dean will draw from the self-study document, the ERC report, comments on this report from the site visit introductory meeting participants, and the unit’s response to the report. The “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan” should contain the following elements.

- An introduction that briefly describes the findings of the evaluation process.
- A record of issues and accomplishments recorded during the course of the review.
- A candid description of the extant strengths and current limitations across the research, teaching, and service missions of the unit.
- A summary of the unit’s development in terms of strategic planning at the college and university levels.
- A list, in priority order, of the unit’s goals and objectives, and the courses of action needed to reach those ends.
- A well-defined plan of action for achieving each goal or objective.
- A statement of who will carry out the action item. If this is an entire unit or department, be sure to include the name of at least one person, accountable for this action and any individual or sub efforts related to this item.
- A timetable for attainment.
- A statement of necessary resources and investments.
How the Report is Developed:

1. The academic dean or associate dean will draft the preliminary “Dean's Response and Implementation Plan” drawing information from the self-study report, the report of the ERC, and all written responses to these reports.

2. The unit head, together with the unit’s faculty, will discuss the preliminary report and propose to the dean revisions as deemed appropriate.

3. The unit head will work with the dean to finalize the report.

4. Once the report is written, the unit head will work with the dean to reach agreement on issues and actions in the plan. Budgetary ramifications may be included in the plan and should be clearly indicated in the relevant areas.

5. After agreement has been reached between the unit head and the dean, and the document has been revised accordingly, the dean will present the Implementation Plan to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The dean or associate dean and the unit head will meet with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to discuss the Dean's Response and Implementation Plan. Ideally, this final meeting in the program review process will take place within six months of the site visit.

6. Although the dean has oversight for the Implementation Plan, the Provost, or the Senior Vice Provost if designated by the Provost, may negotiate specific changes to the plan in cases where university priorities indicate a need to do so.

7. It is the responsibility of the dean to integrate the goals and objectives of the memorandum into the college's strategic plan.

8. Following the unit’s review, the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs may request periodic summaries (1-2 pages) of progress the unit has made in implementing the recommendations in the Implementation Plan.