O | UNIVERSITY OF OREGON | Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs

Program Review
University of Oregon

The Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs
Last updated: September 23, 2016

Program Review

Table of Contents

Introduction to Program Review

Periodic review of each University of Oregon degree program is essential to maintaining excellence and for effective long-range planning and self-improvement. 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. At the conclusion of the review, programs will be able to:

1. Describe the quality and value of the unit's academic programs as seen through the eyes of the faculty, students, and administrators.
2. Possibly revise the 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. Clarify the program goals, strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities.
4. Communicate their strategic priorities (aligned with their program goals) and identify the associated resources needed to achieve excellence.

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 the Provost and Academic Affairs (OPAA) 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. Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs meets with Deans and Associate Deans to discuss upcoming reviews.

2. Dean notifies Unit Head.

3. SVP of Academic Affairs meets with Unit Head and Dean/Associate Dean 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 (comprehensive guidelines found later in this document), which should

      a.   Identify comparators (external and internal to UO);
      b.   Address issues surrounding equity and inclusion, and internationalization;
      c.   Ensure that both TTF and NTTF are adequately represented in the self-study;
      d.   Incorporate data from the following sources into the self-study:

               Institutional Research (IR)
               Graduate School
               Vice President for Research and Innovation Office (Sponsored Research)
               Library;

      e.   Include data in appendices;
      f.   Compile self-study and appendices into one PDF document.

7. SVP contacts External Review Committee (ERC); OPAA arranges lodging and transportation.

8. OPAA schedules introductory and exit meetings for site visit.

9. Department/unit schedules remaining meetings for site visit.

       (NOTE: Please keep Dean and Associate Dean updated on meeting dates and times).

10. OPAA sends self-study to reviewers four weeks in advance of site visit.

11. Site visit takes place.

12. Reviewers submit report; SVP of Academic Affairs reviews and distributes.

13. Administrators from introductory meeting provide comments on reviewers' (ERC) report.

14. SVP sends comments to Dean/Associate Dean and Unit Head.

15. Unit head consults with faculty and sends unit response to SVP and Dean/Associate Dean.

16. Dean or Associate Dean submits Dean's Response and Implementation Plan to SVP.

17. SVP, Unit Head, and Dean or Associate Dean meet to discuss Dean's Response and Implementation Plan.

18. SVP will check in with Dean and Unit Head over following years to assess progress of 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 unit 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 report is drafted by the Dean and or his or her designees and submitted to the Senior Vice Provost within six months of the site visit.

Planning Phase:

Academic units shall be notified by the Senior Vice Provost approximately four-six months in advance of the site visit.

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 Unit Head 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 Unit Head have discussed the initiation of a review, the unit begins to prepare a self-study document about the degree program(s) under review.

The 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, 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 the UO administration, including OPAA, the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, the Division of Equity and Inclusion, and the Office of International Affairs. The ERC then meets separately with the relevant Dean and/or Associate Dean. Subsequently, the ERC meets with the 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 Unit Head. The UO administrative introductory meeting participants will be called to a meeting by the Senior Vice Provost two-four weeks following the receipt for the ERC report. The Senior Vice Provost will then transmit to the Dean/Associate Dean and Unit Head the input from the UO administration, as well as the ERC report, for analysis, review, and commentary. The Unit Head will consult with the faculty and submit their response to the ERC report to the Dean/Associate Dean and Senior Vice Provost.

Dean's Response and Implementation Plan:
(See final pages of this document for more complete guidelines)

Next, the Dean/Associate 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/Associate Dean and Unit Head to discuss the program review report, implementation of the recommendations, and follow-up.

Follow-up:

In the years after the review the Unit Head and Dean/Associate Dean will periodically submit a progress report to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Program Review
Timeline

Spring/Summer prior to review
- OPAA hosts planning meeting (#1) with Deans and Associate Deans.
- OPAA hosts planning meeting (#2) with Associate Deans and Unit Heads.
- Unit under review submits list of potential reviewers to Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs.
- Dean consults with SVP regarding issues relevant to the review, and any additions to the self-study.

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) data; Academic Analytics data, Library data, Graduate School data; include issues surrounding equity and inclusion, NTTF, grad/undergrad students, international affairs.
- OPAA requests data for units from IR (including SERU data and Academic Analytics data, demographic data, etc.), VPRI office data on sponsored research, Library data, Graduate School data.
- OPAA hosts planning meeting (#3) with Unit Heads, Deans/Associate Deans, and support staff.
- OPAA contacts reviewers, schedules date of site visit, and arranges and pays for travel and accommodations.

Six weeks prior to site visit
- Unit under review creates itinerary for site visit and forwards it to OPAA for review.
- Unit under review sends self-study as one .pdf file to Dean/Associate Dean.

Four weeks prior to site visit
- Dean/Associate Dean sends self-study as one .pdf file to OPAA.
- OPAA shares self-study with reviewers and UO administration team attending introductory site-visit meeting with reviewers.

During site visit
- Unit under review hosts external reviewers.
- Dean/Associate Dean participates in site visit and provides guidance to reviewers.

After site visit
- OPAA forwards external report to Unit Head, Dean/Associate Dean, and UO administrators from site visit introductory meeting.
- Senior Vice Provost calls meeting with UO administrators from site visit introductory meeting to gather feedback regarding site visit and ERC report. Senior Vice Provost transmits feedback from this meeting to the Dean.
- Unit Head submits response to ERC report to Dean and Senior Vice Provost.
- Dean's Response and Implementation Plan are submitted to Senior Vice Provost.
- Senior Vice Provost, Dean and Unit Head meet to discuss report and comments.
- Unit Head and Dean periodically submit progress report to Senior Vice Provost in following years.

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 unit to conduct healthy self-examination, affirm current practices, propose changes, and receive constructive criticism which will guide prioritization of resources and strategic planning for future excellence.

Self-Study

The self-study document (see "Self-Study Format") is the unit's main opportunity to provide background information about the 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. The target length is between 10-30 pages, plus appendices. All members of the unit's faculty should have input in, and have read, the final self-study.

Site Visit

In order to make the most efficient use of the site visit, the Unit Head should communicate with the faculty, staff and students in advance of the site visit to clarify the process. The unit should be prepared to provide any additional information requested by the External Review Committee (ERC) beyond the self-study.

The 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 UO administrators (see section entitled "Sample Schedule for Site Visit"). The Unit Head should review the proposed schedule with the Dean/Associate Dean and with the Senior Vice Provost. Remember, the Senior Vice Provost will make first contact with potential reviewers.

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

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 Unit Head. 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. 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, unless they have an exceptionally strong program in the area under review.

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. OPAA 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, the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and UO administrators, including the Vice Provost for Research and Innovation, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Equity and Inclusion, and the Vice Provost for International Affairs.

2. Meet with Dean/Associate Dean of the College or School to whom the unit reports.

3. Meet with Unit Head.

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

5. Tour facilities.

Day Two

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

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 Unit Head.

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

8. Exit meeting with the Senior Vice Provost and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and UO administrators representing the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Innovation, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, the Division of Equity and Inclusion, the Office of International Affairs, 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 length between 10-30 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 Unit Head to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. It will be distributed by the Office of the Provost and 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. Insert the unit's assessment plan in Appendix C, and, if not directly addressed in the Plan, describe what the graduates of your programs should know and be able to do when they leave the university (i.e., goals/ outcome/ objectives – approximately 3-5). How does the unit assess the extent to which students have met these expectations (i.e.: could be as simple as a 2-hour faculty meeting in which one of the above goals is addressed and faculty discuss the strengths and weaknesses of graduating students related to that one goal)? Describe an example of the unit "closing the loop" and using the information gleaned from assessment to make change. For example, if weaknesses related to one of the goals have been identified, what changes were made in specific classes or experiences for students to improve their learning in this area?

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. Add the unit's diversity plan and IDEAL data (https://inclusion.uoregon.edu/IDEAL) to Appendix G.

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** - 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 are the unit's short, intermediate, and long-term goals? What is the unit's plan to reach these goals?

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 – Attach the descriptions and requirements for all undergraduate degrees in your program as Appendix A of this packet. These should include the total number of required credits, the credit distribution, and 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 the program's general education offerings and service courses to other disciplines play in the curriculum? List 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 Online and Hybrid Learning - Describe the extent the unit uses online or hybrid learning environments. Comment on the use of classroom management technology (e.g., Canvas) in the undergraduate curriculum.

2. **Student Characteristics**

    2.1 Number of Students and Enrollment Patterns – Refer to the data for your program and 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 – Refer to the data for your program and 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 – Refer to 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 the two internal comparators, 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 – Refer to the data and 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 the internal comparators 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), pro-tem, NTTF, and graduate employees? 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 the long-term effectiveness of the program? How satisfied is the unit with the breadth and quality of the various parts of the curriculum? 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, peer evaluation via classroom visitations, post-graduation surveys of students, etc.)? Discuss the results of these assessments. Comment on how this unit compares to similar units and the University as a whole.

   4.4 Student Satisfaction – By referring to the data in the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) or the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data, describe any changes that have been made or will be made in the undergraduate program based on these measures.

   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 – Add the master's degree requirements to Appendix A and 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. 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 curricular 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 – Add the doctoral degree requirements to Appendix A and 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. 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 Oregon state institutions, or with external partners. What is the rationale for these relationships? Identify other programs where graduate 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. Add the unit's General Duties and Responsibilities Statement (GDRS) to Appendix H.

   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 internal and external comparators. Discuss how current funding affects the recruitment of graduate students to your program.

2. **Student Characteristics**

   2.1 Number of Students and Enrollment Patterns – Refer to the data and 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 – Refer to the data on the demographic characteristics (including age, gender, race/ethnicity) of graduate students and 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 the internal comparators 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 – Refer to the data and 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 the internal comparators 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 pro-tem NTTF? How do these proportions compare to those for the internal comparators? If non-instructional staff share responsibility for delivering the curriculum, describe the nature of their role and the rationale for this practice. If graduate employees 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 they will 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 – Discuss the data provided by the Graduate School regarding graduate-student advising and quality of instruction within the graduate curriculum. Discuss your interpretation of 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 provided by the Graduate School. 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.   <u>FACULTY</u>

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 in Appendix D an alphabetic list of TTF and Career NTTF faculty members, their ranks, the number of master's and doctoral committees they have headed and/or served on during the past five years, and current curriculum vitae (CVs) for each TTF and Career NTTF faculty member. Also include CVs for any currently appointed pro-tem NTTF, and any others (e.g., emeriti, participating, or courtesy faculty) who are appointed in the unit.

A. **Numbers and Status**

1. **Size and Composition** – Refer to Appendix D and 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, pro-tem NTTF) a part of the unit's programs? Do faculty members from other university units serve important roles within the unit? Describe these. What is the typical duration of involvement for pro-tem 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? Provide data in Appendix I for 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. Also include data on faculty retirements and resignations.

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, IR and Sponsored Research 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 faculty 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 candid descriptive overview of the quality of the research, teaching, and service of faculty in the unit. How do evaluations of faculty teaching compare to comparators and to the University as a whole (considering peer review, not just student evaluations)? 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 units, 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** - Attach a copy of the unit's policies for TTF review, promotion, and tenure, and for NTTF review and promotion. Provide a copy of any other standards or forms used to evaluate teaching, research/performance, or service. What is the peer teaching review template made up of? (attach unit's template for performance reviews and peer teaching observations in Appendix F or see Academic Affairs website for suggestions for observation tools, report templates etc.)

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 (or equivalent), please list each degree, pathway, specialization, concentration, and/or formally recognized certificate program. Identify each separate option or program as undergraduate, master's or doctoral. Attach all undergraduate and graduate majors, minors, certificate, and specialization requirements.

Degrees or Certificates:

Descriptive Title	Percentage of Majors in Option / Certificate	Percentage of Faculty (by type) who Teach in Option / Certificate

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 (note: the entire set of data may be provided in Appendix E.)

C. **Assessment Plan** - Include the current version of your 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 pro-tem 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.

F.   **Review Templates –** Include templates for faculty performance reviews and peer review of teaching.

G.   **Diversity Plan –** Include a copy of the unit's diversity plan.

H.   **General Duties and Responsibilities Statement** - for graduate students.

I.   **Faculty Recruitment, Retirements, and Resignations** – Provide records and success rates.

Appendices additional to those listed above may be added as appropriate and might include:

- A brief department or unit history since the last review
- The department/unit's constitution or mission statement
- *Ad Hoc* or other committee reports
- Student Handbook (Graduate, Undergraduate or both)

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, feedback from the UO administrators, 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 extent of the 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 submit the Implementation Plan to the 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 Implementation Plan into the college's strategic plan.

8. In the years 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 from the Implementation Plan.