10,000 graduate students
3,000 graduate faculty
99 doctoral programs
137 master’s programs
7 professional programs
What is review?

critique or evaluation;
a critical article or report;
judgement with consequence.
Overview

1. Review & Assessment
2. Periodic Program Review
3. One-time Doctoral Review
Assessment & Review
Quality

Review

Assessment
REVIEW
- Periodic
- Outside evaluators
- Program quality indicators

ASSESSMENT
- Ongoing
- Program Faculty
- Student learning
Review

• GPA / GRE
• Publications
• Rankings
• Compare to AAU
• Time to degree
• Student Survey Results

Assessment

• Depth of Knowledge
• Critical Thinking
• Communication
• Other
• Time to degree
• Student Survey Results
BTW, the review can include review of the assessment plan.
Faculty Buy in

Ownership
Not punitive
“Make it Meaningful”
“Use your Professional Judgment”
Graduate Program Review
Foundational Thoughts

- Constructive, not punitive
- Forward looking
- It’s about good judgment
- Data-informed, not data-driven
- It cannot be formulaic
Periodic Graduate Program Review

- Embedded within Departmental Review
- Cyclic, with Dean’s input
- Strength: Holistic
- Weakness: Can be less focused
Departmental Review

1. Self study
2. External Reviewers
3. Report
4. Plan of Action
5. Data
6. Review
7. Interview
8. Assess
9. Evaluate
10. Meet with Provost

The Graduate School
Data informing the self study

• Faculty
• Diversity
  • Race/ethnicity of recent PhD graduates to AAU
• Research
• Educational Programs
  • Time to degree, completion patterns, enrollment trends
  • Graduate stipends against benchmarks
  • Placement of PhDs
  • Graduate Student Survey Results
External reviewers

- Dept. nominates (6); VP chooses (3)
- Dinner with Vice Provost and Dean
- B’fast with Chair
- Meet with
  - Faculty (separate with untenured faculty)
  - Undergraduate and Graduate Students
  - Some Administrators*
- Exit Meeting
  - Chair
  - Provost group*  *ME
Plan of Action

• Unique feature
• Developed by Department
• Shared, revised w/ Dean, VP, Provost
• Align w/ strategic plan
• Binding annual and future reviews
The 2008 Doctoral Assessment
Doctoral Quality Initiative

• **2006 Provost initiative**
  • Goal of identifying doctoral programs that will enhance the standing of Ohio State. Invest in high quality programs. Disinvest in weak and non-core programs.

• **2008 Doctoral review**
  • Data intensive review. College submit its review. Faculty review committee.

• **Adaptive Feedback Process**
  • GS meeting with Colleges, identify enhancement and disinvestment. GS compile results. Dialogues with Provost, Graduate Dean, College Deans. Final decision by Provost.

• **Result**
  • 3K programs. Graduate program restructuring.
Quality Indicators

Student Input
GPA, GREs, Fellowship success

Student Output
Completion Rates, Time to degree, Placement

Student Diversity

Overall Program Quality and centrality
Criteria for Enhancement

• New or emerging opportunities where Ohio State can excel
• Gaining a competitive edge
• Improvements in addressing diversity
• New Approaches to recruiting high-quality students
• Commitment of department and college to strengthening the program
# 2008 Doctoral Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rankings</th>
<th># Doctoral Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Developing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassess/Restructure</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinvestment/Elimination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intended
- Eliminate/ reorganize weak programs
- Reward Excellence
- Strong stayed strong

Unintended
- Entitlement
- Uneven playing field
- Lack of assessment
Graduate Program Review

PERIODIC
- Comparison to similar programs nationally
- Looking at trajectory

ONE TIME
- Ability to compare to dissimilar programs locally
- Snapshot
- Share best practices locally
Questions for thought

1. Do reviews change as priorities change?
2. Are GPA and GRE defensible criteria?
3. Should individual student output > input?
4. Is what’s important being reviewed?
Questions

Discussion