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Introduction
Program review is essential for the development, growth, and sustainability of excellence in graduate degree programs. In order for WSU to maintain and enhance its research strengths, it is vital that the university maximizes the potential for sustainable excellence in doctoral education in all fields. In recognition of this imperative, the Graduate School has revitalized and reinvented the process of graduate program review.

Background
In 2005, President V. Lane Rawlins and Provost and Executive Vice President Robert C. Bates commissioned the first university-wide Graduate Education Commission (GEC). The GEC was charged to “articulate a new identity for graduate education at WSU and to propose the means to achieve this identity” (GEC Report, 2006, p.4). The GEC provided 13 recommendations related to the enhancement of doctoral education at WSU; one of those recommendations was to “develop and implement a performance-driven model for routinely assessing and evaluating the
quality of graduate programs” (GEC Report, 2006, p. 3). This recommendation encouraged a focus on student-centered factors such as student quality, mentoring, time to degree, and percent of PhD students completing their degree.

In 2008, the Graduate School hired a director of graduate planning and assessment to coordinate its program review and assessment process. A schedule was set for programs to develop self-studies and assessment plans, and the Graduate School began conducting program reviews. The program review process was updated in 2011 to provide more timely and relevant information to graduate chairs and directors regarding program quality, faculty involvement, student learning outcomes, and climate. These changes further supported the university’s regional accreditation requirements, especially in the area of educational assessment.

PhD Program Review Process

In Summer, 2011, all doctoral programs were asked to participate in the updated review process—an objective process that would involve self-study, a review of data provided by Institutional Research, and an evaluation of the program’s policies and practices that support graduate students. The goals of the PhD program review process were to (1) improve the training and education of graduate students; (2) ensure that graduate students are optimally prepared for careers; and (3) increase the overall research capacity of the university.

In preparation for the review, each doctoral program was asked to submit the following information:

1. **Student Handbook** or similar documents describing the program structure, curriculum, policies, and practices
2. **Assessment Plan** including program objectives, student learning outcomes, data sources, assessment tools, and recent assessment or self-study reports
3. **Student Annual Reviews of all Doctoral Students** (2010-2011 academic year)
4. **List of All Current Students** with indication of financial support (assistantships, fellowships, etc.)
5. **List of Recent PhD Graduates** with information describing their employment history since graduation from WSU

While this information was being collected, the Graduate School, with assistance from the Office of Grants and Research Development and Institutional Research, assembled and analyzed the following data:

1. **Programs of Study** — A sample of 10 programs of study for students in the program was reviewed for consistency, adherence to policy, use of conjoint and cooperative courses, and faculty committee composition. These documents were taken from the Graduate School’s Imaging System.
2. **Catalog Courses** — Courses listed in the catalog were reviewed; conjoint and cooperative courses were noted for discussion during the review meeting.
3. **Program Profiles** — The Program Profile, compiled by Institutional Research, shows new enrollment and total enrollment from 2006 through 2011; degrees conferred over that time; average time to degree for full-time, part-time and overall; cohort performance (retention); graduate assistantships by student and department; and faculty involvement (chairing committees).

4. **Teacher Assignment Data**— This data, also captured by Institutional Research, shows the faculty who served as committee chairs for students by major and by appointing department for Fall 2011.

5. **Research Profile** — The research profile is run from the Institutional Research website and includes proposals submitted, grants awarded, and grant expenditure by department/unit over several fiscal years.

6. **Graduate Student Survey Data** — In Spring 2011, the WSU Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) conducted a comprehensive, university-wide survey of all graduate students regarding their perceptions of their program and faculty, mentoring, assistantships, and climate both at the program and university level. Programs were given aggregate data for their program and average responses for the entire surveyed student population.

All of the program review data was summarized in a discussion guide used at the program review meeting. (See Appendix A for an outline of the guide.) In Spring 2012, the Graduate School hired an assessment coordinator to assist with the program review process. Meetings were scheduled for the Graduate School dean, the associate deans, and the assessment coordinator to meet with the department chair and/or program director for every PhD program offered at WSU. Program faculty and staff were also welcome to attend the review meetings. The program review was completed in June, 2012 with 100% of PhD programs participating in the review process. (See Appendix B for a schedule of the program reviews.)

In addition to the PhD program review meetings, the Graduate School team met with all college associate deans on March 26th and with all master’s-only and professional program directors on May 21st to discuss the Graduate School’s program review process, share program profile and teacher assignment data with individual programs and colleges, and update faculty and staff on the University’s assessment reporting and regional accreditation requirements.

**Graduate School Program Review and Assessment SharePoint Site**

At the request of the associate deans and program directors, the Graduate School developed a SharePoint site to provide access to the program review materials and assessment best practices and examples identified by the Graduate School during the program review process.

**PhD Program Review Meetings**

The program reviews meetings, by themselves, created an opportunity for faculty and program staff to focus on key issues impacting graduate students and their experience at WSU. It stimulated discussions about questions such as: Is the program teaching and training students effectively? Does the program meet institutional goals? Are faculty involved in creating and implementing the program’s vision? In addition, the program reviews pointed out program
strengths as well as weaknesses and helped faculty and program staff to identify strategies for program improvement and enhancement.

The majority of program chairs and directors who participated in the program review meetings expressed appreciation of the perspectives offered by the Graduate School team, although a few individuals questioned and/or raised concerns regarding the critiques, suggestions, and/or data provided to them. Several programs had made substantive changes to their curricula and/or graduate programs while other programs were restructuring or experiencing changes in key leadership and/or faculty positions but had not yet documented the changes as part of their assessment process. The program review meetings followed the discussion guide prepared by the Graduate School. For example, discussion topics included the following:

1. Changes in university policy that impact graduate students and faculty such as:
   - Changes in the Faculty Senate approval process for conjoint courses and encouragement to reduce the number of conjoint courses in the curriculum.
   - Reduction in the number of required core credits (allowable per Graduate School policy).
   - Proposed changes in Graduate School grading policy for 800/700/702 credits (S/F to S/U).
   - Changes in faculty advising and graduate committee reporting in the new zzusis system.

2. Program quality, institutional data, research and teaching assistantships, and student outcomes:
   - Student recruitment and admission issues including efforts to attract diverse students
   - Retention issues and strategies for increasing student completion rates
   - Interdisciplinarity in graduate courses, degree programs, and research activities
   - Faculty retention/workload issues; faculty participation in graduate programs; graduate advising
   - Updates and enhancements to student handbooks such as student learning outcomes, student annual review forms, information for new students, checklists for adequate academic progress, and links to Graduate School policies and procedures (See Appendix C for a list of recommended handbook topics.)
   - Teaching assistantship training and measurement; providing structured teaching and research experiences as integral components of the program curriculum
   - Professional development for students in the form of seminars, colloquia, and 1-credit courses
   - Program data and open-ended feedback from the 2011 Graduate Student Survey including academic rigor/academic quality, overall quality of the faculty, availability of courses, writing and submitting articles for publication, writing and submitting grant proposals for funding, preparation to work collaboratively, preparation to work with people from diverse backgrounds, teaching experience, faculty advising, career advising, support from graduate committee members, and climate issues related to the program, the university, and/or the community at large

3. Assessment plans, graduate assessment practices, use of assessment data for program improvement:
• Student learning outcomes, data collection matrices, rubrics to assess academic milestones, and timetables to stay on track
• Data sources such as student annual reviews, CVs, focus groups, student portfolios, TA/RA evaluations, exit interviews, and post-graduation and employer surveys
• Student annual reviews including review formats, data collection methods, completion rates, student and faculty input, departmental review, and setting expectations for the coming year
• Assessment review and reporting processes; using assessment for program improvement and enhanced decision making from admissions to graduation and post-graduation
• Strategies for collecting employment data from graduates using social media (LinkedIn), surveys, and faculty resources
• Professional accreditation requirements for selected programs and regional accreditation for the University including all graduate and professional degree programs

Several program chairs and directors took advantage of the Graduate School’s offer for follow-up regarding the university’s graduate assessment and regional accreditation requirements. The Graduate School’s assessment coordinator met with faculty and program staff to discuss their assessment plan and enhancements to their data collection and review processes. To date, these meetings have been very productive and indicate progress in implementing assessment across all graduate and professional programs.

Graduate Program Assessment Review Reports
Assessment of student learning has always been an integral part of graduate education; however, it has become increasingly important to formalize the process and make the results broadly accessible for program improvement. Provost Warwick Bayley noted in a January 2012 memo to the academic leadership of the university that particular attention should be given to increasing the university’s assessment capacity and documenting how assessment results are used to inform change and decision making in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Similarly, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), WSU’s accrediting agency, has consistently expressed the need for WSU to strengthen the assessment process in all of its educational programs. Consequently, the Graduate School included a review and discussion of each program’s assessment plan and use of assessment data in the program review process.

As part of the review process, all graduate and professional programs were required to submit an assessment review report to the Graduate School by September 1st, in which faculty identified, discussed, and analyzed data related to student learning outcomes as well as the overall quality of the program. A suggested outline for the assessment review report was provided to programs at the review meetings, on the Graduate School’s Planning and Assessment Web site, and on the Graduate School’s Program Review and Assessment SharePoint site. (See Appendix D for the assessment review report outline and Appendix E for more details about graduate program assessment.)

In addition, the Graduate School team initiated regular meetings with the director of the Office of Assessment of Teaching and Learning (ATL). The purpose of these meetings is to share
information about the program review and assessment process, coordinate undergraduate and graduate reporting requirements, and support the University’s accreditation process.

**Next Steps/Future Plans**

The PhD program review process has facilitated new discussions and perspectives on graduate education and the quality of graduate degree programs at WSU. Building on this experience, the Graduate School is considering the following next steps in the program review and assessment process for 2012-13:

- Provide written feedback to graduate and professional programs that participated in the program review process
- Develop a plan for continued graduate program assessment including assessment goals and standards for all graduate and professional programs
- Conduct a workshop for graduate program coordinators and faculty on assessment planning and using student learning outcomes for program improvement
- Work with program faculty and assessment coordinators to identify best practices and develop templates and assessment practices that other programs can use to improve their assessment of student learning and achievement
- Conduct program reviews with master’s-only and professional programs, improve technical support and feedback to graduate and professional programs, and meet internal and external reporting requirements
- Organize a Graduate Advisory Committee (GAC) with at least one representative from each college/campus to:
  - Develop strategic goals and priorities related to graduate program assessment across the university
  - Assist the Graduate School in implementing these goals and priorities
  - Provide feedback and recommendations regarding the assessment process for graduate and professional programs
  - Help communicate and coordinate the graduate program assessment process at the college and/or campus level
### Appendices

**Appendix A: Graduate School PhD Program Review Discussion Guide**

#### Summary of Program
- Questions/Recommendations

#### Handbook
- Recommendations

#### Student Evaluations
- Recommendations

#### Employment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Reviewed (##)</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number working in Faculty Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number working as Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number working in Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current Student Funding (number of students = ##)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Funding</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State funded RA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funding/own support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment Plan
- Recommendations

#### Student Survey (N varies between ## and ##)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations
-
## Appendix B: Spring 2012 PhD Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD Program</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Molecular Plant Sciences</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>2/6/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 English</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mechanical and Materials Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>2/13/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chemistry</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2/14/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Economics and Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Physics</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nutrition and Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>2/23/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>2/23/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Biological and Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>2/28/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sociology</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>3/5/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Materials Science and Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>3/6/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Entomology</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>3/8/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Communication</td>
<td>College of Communication</td>
<td>3/8/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Plant Pathology</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>3/13/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>3/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Electrical Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>3/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Engineering Science</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>3/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mathematics</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>3/23/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nursing</td>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>3/26/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Criminal Justice</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>3/29/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>4/4/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Molecular Biosciences</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4/5/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Biological Sciences: Biology, Botany, and Zoology</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4/6/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Prevention Science</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>4/9/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Veterinary Science: Veterinary Clinical Sciences</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4/11/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Teaching and Learning (Education)</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>4/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Veterinary Science: Combined Anatomic Pathology, Clinical Microbiology, and Immunology and Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4/16/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Neuroscience and Veterinary and Comparative Anatomy, Pharmacology, and Physiology</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4/18/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Animal Sciences</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>4/19/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Counseling Psychology, Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>4/20/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 American Studies</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4/20/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Anthropology</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4/24/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Food Science</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>4/25/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Business Administration: Accounting</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>4/26/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Psychology: Clinical and Experimental</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 History</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>5/3/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Crop Science</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>5/4/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Soil Science</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>5/4/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Environmental and Natural Resource Sciences</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>5/8/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Geology</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>5/8/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Individual Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>5/8/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Horticulture</td>
<td>CAHNRS</td>
<td>5/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Political Science</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>6/6/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Graduate School Student Handbook Recommendations

1. Update your student handbook on an annual basis. The Graduate School updates its policies and procedures every spring and then publishes an updated manual during the summer for the following fall.
2. Provide links to the Graduate School’s Policies and Procedures manual, as well as to the Graduate Student’s Rights and Responsibilities document.
3. Include in your handbook state residency information and information relevant to international students.
4. Provide guidelines for academic and research progress in the handbook.
5. Be sure to note that if you offer a qualifying examination and the student fails to pass it after the allowed number of attempts, the program will notify the Graduate School to recommend disenrollment from the program.
6. A comprehensive student handbook should include the following topics and/or sections:

   Welcome (from the Director or Chair)
   Introduction
   New Student Information
   - Office Assignment
   - Keys
   - Residency Requirements
   - Map
   - I-9 Forms, W-4 Forms, Tax Information (International Students)
   - Automatic Payroll Deposit
   - Social Security Numbers
   General Information
   - Department Office
   - E-mail
   - Central Services and Facilities (CUB, Libraries, Parking, etc.)
   - Counseling Services
   Graduate Program Administration
   - Program Bylaws
   - Graduate Coordinators
   - Academic Coordinator
   Academic Requirements, Policies, and Procedures
   - Degree Options
   - Advisor
   - Committee
   - Annual Evaluations
   - Student Learning Outcomes for Program

---

1 This list of recommendations was revised to include Student Learning Outcomes, standards for adequate academic progress, and other topics during the program review process. An updated list was posed on the Graduate School’s program review SharePoint site.
Standards for Adequate Academic Progress
Continuous Enrollment Policy
Graduation
Checklist
Thesis/Dissertation Binding
Continuation for Another Degree
Milestones for Successful Completion of Graduate Degree
Graduate Coursework
Seminars
Thesis/Dissertation Guidelines
Major Examinations
Graduate Assistantships
  Appointment
  Leave Guidelines
  Residency Requirement
Business Policies
Grievances
Appendices
  Graduate Student Annual Review Form
  TA Evaluation Form
  Other Information
Appendix D: Suggested Outline for the Graduate Program Assessment Review Report

Instructions: The primary focus, and most significant part, of the Assessment Review Report should be issues identified through the program’s assessment process as strengths or weaknesses. Therefore, programs should concentrate their efforts on the Analysis of Issues section. Recommendations for the future should be concise and presented in the context of the identified issues. Page limit (excluding appendices) should be ten (10) pages, unless major issues arise and approval is given by the Director of Graduate Planning and Assessment. Please identify acronyms and initials and try to avoid jargon. When completed, the self-study report should be sent in MS Word to the Director of Graduate Planning and Assessment.

Program Title: ________________________________  Scope of Assessment (MS/PhD): ________

Historical Overview: This section should provide a brief historical overview of the program and a description of the current status of the unit: how it is organized, programmatic/service areas, number of members, etc.

Program Mission Statement: This section should provide the program’s mission.

Strategic Fit within the University: This section should provide a description of how the program reflects the university’s strategic priorities. Visit http://www.strategicplan.wsu.edu/ for more information.

Program Objectives: Beginning with the program’s mission statement, determine the broad objectives that define what it means to be an effective program.

Student Learning Outcomes: Provide a full description of each outcome, methods of assessment, related measures, and expectations by level. The Assessment Review Report is an opportunity for the department to describe, analyze and present additional data. The report should address what data was collected (surveys, interviews, rubric scores, annual reviews, etc.) and the procedures and methods used to analyze the data.

Analysis of Issues: This section should form the bulk of the report. Each issue should be explored with enough description to allow the reader to understand the nature of the issue and why it is important for the unit. (See Assessment Review and Report-Evaluation and Analysis, http://www.gradschool.wsu.edu/FacultyStaff/Assessment/Phases.aspx#Phase3)

Graduate Program Assessment Summary: This section should describe the strengths and weaknesses of the program, including how strengths will be reinforced and weaknesses addressed. State what improvements are needed and what will be the long- and short-term benefits.

Major Recommendations:

1. Goals and priorities for next three to four years (taking into account the issues that have been identified).
2. Describe your plan to improve the quality and strategic positioning of the program. Plans should be as explicit as possible and address the areas needing improvement, how progress will be evaluated, the specific metrics that will be used to gauge your success, and timeline for implementation.

Other Appropriate Issues:

Appendices (optional):

1. Most recent unit Annual Report and Strategic Plan
2. Program By-laws (with list of approved Program Faculty)
3. Graduate Program Metrics: quality measures of applicants/admits/enrollees; analysis of PhD student completion rates, time to degree, and placement record for the past five years (as applicable)
Appendix E: Graduate Assessment Process and Guidelines

Introduction: The principal criterion of a graduate program’s academic excellence relies on the quality of its faculty, entering students, graduates, and the overall academic experience as perceived by those internally and externally associated with the program. Assessment of WSU’s graduate programs is intended to be a regular, ongoing, iterative process that completes the following:

- Evaluates each graduate program’s quality and effectiveness
- Stimulates program planning and improvement
- Encourages graduate degree programs to develop in directions that reflect the University's strategic priorities

Planned assessment ensures that each degree program systematically evaluates strengths, weaknesses, and progress made in achieving the goals and objectives of the program. The assessment process also requires that the program’s faculty members are working effectively as educators, mentors, and administrators; and students are receiving the best education and career preparation possible.

Phase I: Development of a Graduate Program’s Assessment Plan: The Graduate School mandates that each program have clearly articulated learning outcomes that are available to all students. What counts as evidence of success, with respect to graduate student learning outcomes, is the province of each graduate program’s faculty with oversight from the Graduate School. Program faculty exercise their authority by establishing learning outcomes, designing courses appropriate to achieving those outcomes, and assessing student achievement of those outcomes using methods appropriate to the discipline. The assessment plan should include the program’s mission’s statement and the broad objectives that define what it means to be an effective program. It should also have specific measures that support the program objectives and student learning outcomes. The plan should identify the data that will be collected to evaluate the program’s outcomes, the sources of that data, how often the data will be collected, and who will be in charge of collection, analysis, and reporting.

Phase II: Assessment of the Review Process: Each program should assign an assessment coordinator or faculty member to oversee and implement the assessment plan.

Phase III: Assessment Review Report: The Assessment Review Report should provide the historical overview, mission, and description of how the program reflects the university's strategic priorities, along with the scope and purpose of the assessment. The Assessment Review Report is also an opportunity for the department to describe, analyze, and present additional data.

Phase IV: Review of the Assessment Process: The Graduate School’s assessment coordinator will meet with program faculty and staff to review the assessment process and elicit feedback from the team regarding how the assessment process might be improved.