

**Council of Graduate School Programs
Checklist
Academic Planning and Review Process**

Introduction

Once the Review Leadership Team (RLT) for each unit under review examines the material generated during the assessment process, it drafts a report that addresses the questions posed to focus the review process in light of the material gathered. The RLT's analysis of the answers to these questions shapes the strategic goals established to guide the unit's development for the next five years.

This checklist is designed to help the Council insure that graduate programs have received appropriate and sufficient attention during the review process. The questions posed to focus the review may mean that some of the questions on this checklist beyond categories I and II may not be appropriate.

I. General

1. Does the report answer the questions posed by the RLT for the review?
 - If so, how fully?
 - If not, where lacking?
2. Is the review primarily descriptive or are there evaluative judgments about the quality of the program and the adequacy of the resources?
3. Is the review forward looking rather than just an assessment of the program's current status?
4. Has the review/recommendations provided mechanisms for positive change?
5. Has this review provided a blueprint for planning?
6. Has the review assessed the level of university accountability for the quality of the graduate program?
7. How has this review laid the basis for the improvement of the graduate program?
8. Has the review been academic in focus or has it been financial, i.e. the ability to produce income?

II. External Review Team

1. Are the external reviewers' credentials appropriate for the graduate portion of the review?

2. Did graduate issues get appropriate and sufficient attention by the external review team during the review?

III. Program Mission, Goals, and Objectives

1. Has the review defined how the program contributes to the mission of the university?
2. Is it clear how the graduate program is situated within the University's goals and priorities?
3. Is it clear how the graduate program is set within the Department's goals and priorities?
4. Has the graduate program been viewed as merely an extension of baccalaureate study or does it possess a dynamic of its own?
5. Does the graduate program and department possess the vision and drive to achieve local, regional, and/or national status?

IV. Admission and Recruitment

1. Has the review provided information on the student market for the program and on the department's ability/success in exploiting it?
2. Are the admission requirements and application review process adequate for the selection of qualified students?
3. Has the review provided information on the program's level of attractiveness to potential students?
4. Has the review provided information on the size and stability of the graduate program, so that it is possible to assess the existence, or lack there of, of a critical mass of qualified students?

V. Curriculum

1. Did the review focus attention on the graduate curriculum?
2. Has the program been structured to meet the intended outcomes?
3. Does it demonstrate appropriate rigor?
4. Does it meet the standards of quality as determined by the discipline?

5. How well has the program responded to the profession's needs?
6. Has the department advanced the state of the discipline/profession?
7. How has the program been assessed by experts in the field?

VI. Administration

1. Did the review focus attention on the program's administration environment?
2. How effective has the Department Chair been in the support of the program?
3. How well has the Graduate Program Director served as an advocate for graduate student affairs and as the keeper of student records?
4. To what extent have students been integrated into the life of the department?

VII. Faculty

1. Has the review analyzed the level of faculty involvement in the graduate program?
2. Is the level of faculty involvement appropriate for the program's fields of study?
3. Does the faculty workload reflect its participation in a graduate program?
4. Does the disciplinary participation reflect the state of the fields of study offered by the department?

VIII. Pedagogy, Advising, Mentorship, Professional Training

1. Did the review address the quality of advising/mentoring students?
2. How effective has the teaching and training of students been?
3. Are the appropriate strategies being pursued to prepare students to be professionals in the discipline?

IX. Student Funding

1. Did the review address the level of funding available to students in the program?

2. Did the review evaluate the role of funding in overall program development?
3. Did the review address the competitiveness of the funding available (amount and number of assistantships) in relation to the program's disciplinary competition?

X. Student Placement and Outcomes

1. Did the review assess the program's retention level?
2. Did the review assess time to degree and evaluate the contributing factors?
3. Did the review assess the program's graduation rate?
4. Did the review assess the program's success at job placement?
5. Did the review assess the nature and amount of student accomplishments?