

Graduate School Council Program Review Summary, Recommendation & Presentation Guidelines

Overview

This document provides guidelines that can be used by Graduate School Council Members when preparing Academic Program Review Council Summary Reports. These same guidelines can be used as a template for presenting Program Reviews before the Graduate School Council.

Please note that because Five-year Program Review Reports do not require a written council summary, the guidelines for presentation of five-year reports to council vary slightly from full Program Reviews.

The last section of this document provides information about various Program Review outcomes and will assist Graduate School Council members in making final recommendations to the Dean of the Graduate School about the timeline for the next Program Review.

Guidelines for Full Academic Program Reviews (typically 10-year reviews)

The following information should be included in the Graduate School Council Program Review Summary and sent to progrev@uw.edu at least two weeks prior to the Graduate School Council Meeting during which that Program Review will be discussed.

The information provided in this report, revised according to discussion at the Council meeting, will be used in the Graduate School Dean's letter to the Dean/Chancellor of the unit under review.

Academic Unit Name

Degrees/Certificates included in the Review

Program Strengths

- **In full sentences, list/describe the greatest strengths of the unit and its programs, ranked according to priorities**

Challenges & Risks

- **In full sentences, list/describe the greatest challenges and risks facing the unit and its programs, ranked according to priorities. This may include consideration of unresolved issues from the previous review.**

Areas of Concurrence

- **In full sentences, note areas of concurrence and/or disagreement between the review committee, unit and college/school/campus dean or chancellor.**

Graduate School Council Recommendations

- **In full sentences, list the key recommendations to the Dean of the Graduate School including the timeline for next review.**

Guidelines for Five-year Program Review Reports

The guidelines listed below will assist Graduate School Council representatives in preparing a Five-year Report Summary which will be presented to council. Please note: Unlike 10-year Full Program Reviews, five-year reports do not require a written prepared by the Graduate School Council representative.

The oral summary presented to council based on the unit's five-year report, revised according to discussion at the Council meeting, will be used in the Graduate School Dean's letter to the Dean/Chancellor of the unit under review.

Academic Unit Name

Degree/Certificate on which the Five-year Report focuses

Program Overview and Strengths

Program Challenges

Future Directions/Goals

Council Recommendation

- **Typically, unless there are specific, serious concerns, programs are granted continuing status and incorporated into the unit's next 10-year Full Program Review.**

Program Review Guidelines for Graduate School Council Recommendations

Role of the Council

- Assure confidence in the overall process including the soundness of the Review Committee recommendations.
- Ensure that Review Committee recommendations focus on the long-term success and continuation of the academic program.
- Rely on Review Committee recommendations when making final recommendations to the Dean's office.

Elaboration on Program Review Outcomes

10-year full review (typical outcome)

The Review Committee has no critical questions about the continuing status of any of the academic programs within the unit.

- In the space of ten years, academic units typically have changes in leadership (chairs/directors/deans), will experience some degree of faculty attrition, and will undergo curriculum revisions that respond to student needs or national trends in the discipline. These types of conditions and challenges are considered minor and expected as part of the normal growth or evolution of a program during the ten-year review cycle. Such challenges should not lead to a recommendation for a shorter review timeline or interim report.

Interim Report

The Review Committee has identified specific, critical concerns in the 10-year review that require more immediate attention.

- A recommendation for an Interim Report signals that while Council/Review Committee recommends that the degree program(s) receive continuing status, there are concerns about the long-term viability of the unit's academic program(s).
- Interim Report guidelines should be specific and will typically align recommendations/concerns identified by the Review Committee during the Program Review.
 - Interim Report recommendations should include:
 - Clear description of the critical concerns that were identified by the Review Committee and agreed upon by the Graduate School Council
 - Description of what information the interim report must contain (e.g., what outcomes or actions by the unit are expected by the time of the interim report).
 - Instructions for the unit chair/director to send the Interim Report to both the Graduate School and their Dean/Vice Chancellor
 - Timeline for delivery of the interim report

- Next steps including that the Interim Report will be reviewed by the Graduate School Council
- Description of what recommendations the Graduate School Council may make upon review of the interim report.
 - For example, if limited progress has been made on the critical issues identified during the original review, Council will recommend a follow-up interim report or an interim full program review.
 - Recommendations from the interim report should be limited in scope to the critical issues identified by the original program review.

Interim Full Program Review

There are specific, grave questions about whether the program should receive continuing status. A recommendation for a full interim program review is made by the review committee in consultation with the Graduate School Associate Dean and respective school/college Dean.

- This option should usually only be invoked after an Interim Report has failed to prompt resolution of the Council/Review Committee's initial concerns.