

GUIDELINES
for the
Review of Graduate Programs

Graduate Council
Oregon State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction and Review Criteria	1
Snapshot of Graduate Program Review Process	2
Review Guidelines: INFORMATION FOR PROGRAMS	3
General Overview	3
Timing of Reviews	3
Postponement	3
Self-Study Document	3
The Review Panel	4
Site Visit	6
Review Panel Report	7
Consideration of the Review Panel Report	7
Action Plan	8
Follow-Up	8
PROGRAM CHECKLIST	9
Review Guidelines: INFORMATION FOR REVIEWERS	11
General Overview	11
Self-Study Document	11
The Review Panel	11
Pre-review Dinner	12
Site Visit	12
Review Panel Report	13
Consideration of the Review Panel Report	14
Outline for Review Panel Report	15
REVIEW PANEL MEMBER CHECKLIST	16
Appendix I, Outline for the Self-Study Document	18
Sample Self-Study Sign-off Cover Sheet	21
Model Table A: Applicant Characteristics	22
Model Table B: Student Characteristics	24
Model Table C: Graduate Student Support	25
Model Table D: Graduate Courses	26
Model Table E: Graduate Faculty FTE	27
Model Table F: Graduate Student Awards	28
Model Table G: Degree Completion	29
Model Table H: Theses/Dissertation Titles	30
Model Table I: Placement	31
Appendix II, Sample Current Student Survey	32
Appendix III, Sample Graduate Alumni Survey	35

Guidelines for the Review of Graduate Programs

Graduate Council
Oregon State University

INTRODUCTION

It is the policy of Oregon State University to conduct regular reviews of graduate level academic programs. Various types of reviews are conducted at the university, including reviews at the time new programs are proposed, professional licensing and/or accreditation reviews, and research program reviews. In addition, the Oregon University System (OUS) requires reviews of new programs within their first several years of operation. Graduate Council Program Reviews are institution initiated and they are evaluative. Importantly, they provide an opportunity for programs to reflect on the nature of their graduate instruction and develop approaches to enhancing program quality.

A Graduate Council Program Review provides a mechanism for constructive change. It provides the program an opportunity to review, to evaluate, and to plan in a deliberative and collegial setting. Program reviews can assist in evaluating alignment of the program with institutional and college missions, goals, and strategic directions; alignment with national trends; adequacy of resources; quality of the learning environment and the extent to which learning outcomes are achieved; areas where OSU can further develop its strengths in graduate education; and potential areas for collaborative & interdisciplinary projects for the ultimate purpose of improving the quality of graduate programs.

The Graduate Council Program Review process encourages programs to reflect on and answer the following questions²:

- Who are you?
- What do you do? Why do you do it?
- How well do you do it and who thinks so?
- What difference does it make whether you do it or not? How do you know?
- Do your students, faculty, university, or disciplinary trends demand that you do something different?
- What strategies do you use to enhance diversity within your program?
- How do you intend to evolve into the future, given where you are now?
- How will you evaluate your progress and success?

Review Criteria Graduate Council Program Reviews are evaluative in nature. As such, Program Reviews assess the following three components within the context of the alignment of the mission and goals of the program to the mission and goals of the academic college(s) and the University mission:

1. Inputs—the adequacy of the total resources entering into or supporting the program.
2. Productivity—the level of program performance including the breadth and depth of its capacity to fulfill its mission and goals.
3. Outcomes—the quality of the outcomes that result from the existence of the program.

² From Michigan State University

The review criteria include: a) quality of inputs, b) level of productivity, and c) quality of outcomes. Input assessment refers to the reporting and evaluation of program inputs or resources including context, students, selectivity, curriculum, financial support, personnel, facilities, diversity and organizational support. Analysis of productivity includes both student and faculty performance metrics including student and faculty honors and awards, student and faculty scholarly productivity, student persistence/attrition, curricular productivity, and it refers to the level of performance attained relative to the mission and goals of the program. Outcomes assessment refers to the evaluation of the quality of the outcomes or impacts that result from offering the program including the professional viability of graduates, their satisfaction, and national rankings. **Data relative to the three review criteria should be collected and maintained on a continuous basis by the unit.**

The results of a Graduate Council Program Review are the formal written report of the Review Panel and an action plan developed by the program that will guide the improvement of the program. The outcome expected is quality enhancement.

Graduate program reviews are conducted on a decennial schedule. Supplemental interim reviews may be conducted as requested by the unit, by the college dean, or as deemed appropriate by the Dean of the Graduate School or the Graduate Council.

The following is a snapshot of the review process.

- Program director (or department chair if appropriate) and college dean are notified of scheduled reviews five years in advance and annually thereafter.
- Program director leads preparation of a self-study document.
- Review Panel members are appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School
- The site visit date is established.
- Copies of the self-study document are submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School two weeks in advance of the site visit date.
- The self-study is distributed by the Graduate School to Review Panel members.
- The Review Panel and Dean of the Graduate School review the site visit agenda, the self-study, and areas of focus for the site visit interviews the evening prior to the date of the site visit.
- A day-long site visit with administrators, faculty, graduate students, and staff involved with the program is conducted.
- The Review Panel submits first draft of written report within three weeks of the site visit.
- The review report is formally accepted by the Graduate Council.
- The review report is forwarded to the Provost.
- The program director prepares an action plan that addresses the recommendations in the review report.
- The review report and the action plan are discussed by the Provost, Graduate Dean, program director, college dean(s), and representative of the Graduate Council.
- The outcome of the review process is communicated by the Graduate Dean to the members of the Review Panel.
- A follow-up review by the Graduate Council is typically conducted after three years to assure implementation of the action plan approved by the Provost.

The purpose of this document is to guide both the programs being reviewed and the reviewers in the successful conduct of valuable reviews that lead to the enhancement of program quality.

Guidelines for Graduate Council Program Reviews: Information for *Programs*

General Overview The Graduate School has responsibility for the quality of graduate programs at Oregon State University. Following a standard format, reviews of graduate programs are conducted through the Graduate Council. Graduate Council Program Reviews involve the preparation of a full self-study, a one day site visit by a panel of reviewers, and the approval of a formal report by the Graduate Council.

Timing of Reviews Graduate Council Program Reviews are conducted on a 10-year cycle or more frequently as appropriate. The Dean of the Graduate School is responsible for scheduling program reviews. A 5-year schedule of the proposed timing of program reviews is distributed to the relevant program directors and academic college deans five years in advance and annually thereafter. Requests for changes to this schedule may be directed to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Tentative specific timelines are agreed upon in coordination with the program, the Graduate Council, the prospective reviewers, Graduate School staff, and in coordination with other reviews that may coincide with the Graduate Council Program Reviews such as the Curriculum Council's Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews (UAPR). The Graduate Council does *not* recommend that a Graduate Council Program Review be held in conjunction with a Cooperative States Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) review. **Units considering coordinating CSREES and Graduate Council program reviews must consult the Dean of the Graduate School.**

Postponement Programs may request a postponement of a scheduled Graduate Council Program Review by presenting a compelling case to the Graduate School for the Dean's review and approval. If approved, postponement is normally granted for one year only.

Self-Study Document The primary benefit of the program review process lies in the opportunity for self-analysis and the use of this analysis along with the report of the Review Panel in subsequent program enhancement. Thus, a major component of the program review process is the process involved in the preparation of a self-study document which serves as the primary source of information for the Review Panel.

The program director (or department chair if appropriate) is responsible for guiding the preparation of the self-study and assembling data and materials pertinent to the review. The self-study document should be prepared in close collaboration with the faculty, students, staff, and leadership of the program unit. The program director is responsible for ensuring that all graduate faculty members have an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study or have an opportunity to review the final document.

The self-study should include thorough narrative and tabular descriptions of the program and a thorough self assessment of program strengths, weaknesses, needs, and opportunities for each section. Each section must be prefaced with a narrative description and interpretation of the data and should include, if available, comparison to national and/or peer institution statistics. It is critical to interpret the data for the Review Panel members so that they can understand what is leading to the program's self-recommendations. **A representative from the Graduate Council will review the self-study document and may elect to cancel or postpone the Graduate Program Review if the document is not received by the agreed deadline and/or if the document lacks essential content.**

An outline of the contents of the self-study document is presented in Appendix I. Model tables for presenting data to be included in the self-study are also provided as appendices. Additional data or materials may be included to provide a thorough representation of the program under review. Examples of effective self-study documents are available for review in the Graduate School.

The self-study should begin by presenting the review context. The mission statement of the program should be stated and its relationship to the mission of the college and the University should be presented. The major short and long term goals of the program should be presented as well as the program's strategic plan and diversity plan. Issues that are confronting the program should be described as well as points of pride.

The self-study should present complete and accurate data on inputs, productivity, and outcomes as well as narrative interpretation of these data in answering the questions on page 1 of this document. The program will conduct two surveys prior to the site visit: 1) survey of current graduate students and 2) survey of graduate alumni. Additionally, the Graduate School will provide the program with results from its annual exit survey of degree recipients. To ensure respondent confidentiality, do not include original questionnaires in the self-study or appendices. These data should be tabulated and interpreted in the narrative of the self-study.

Nine (9) copies of the self-study must be delivered to the Graduate School two weeks in advance of the scheduled site visit date. The program also should provide the college dean(s), graduate faculty, students, and others, as appropriate, with a copy of the self-study or access to a copy. Additional copies (minimum 4) may be needed if an Undergraduate Academic Program Review or other review is being conducted concurrently with the Graduate Council Program Review. It is the responsibility of the program director to determine any needs and requirements of other review agencies. Contact the Office of Academic Programs for information about Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews (UAPR).

Failure to provide a self-study in a timely manner and/or lack of cooperation with the review process, will lead to Graduate Program Review report recommending termination of the program and suspension of the enrollment of new students in the program.

The Review Panel The Review Panel is appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Graduate Dean works with the program director to identify external panelists, and with the chair of the Graduate Council to assign Graduate Council panelists. The Review Panel is composed of one member of the Graduate Council, two additional members of the OSU Graduate Faculty, at

least one external academic disciplinary peer, and at least one prospective employer of degree recipients. Additional external panelists may be desirable. Usually, the external academic disciplinary peer member of the Review Panel is designated to chair the Panel. When a Graduate Council Program Review is held in conjunction with an outside agency review, a representative of the Graduate Council is appointed Panel Chair. The Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School accompany the Review Panel during the site visit to assist in the review.

To form the Panel, the Graduate Dean solicits nominations of external reviewers from the program director. Nominations of external reviewers must include each nominee's complete name, title, address, telephone number, email address, and URL of the individual's academic department or corporation. The nominees should include a minimum of three academic peers and a minimum of three prospective employers, listed separately. It may be appropriate for some programs to submit the names of people in academia as prospective employers because most of the graduates of their programs find employment as faculty members in academia.

Generally *not* considered for appointment to the Review Panel are former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members, former OSU students, former OSU employees, individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU, or individuals from institutions substantially different in character from OSU who would be less likely to understand local circumstances. The Graduate Dean may consult with the academic dean regarding the selection of reviewers from among those nominated. The credibility of the review will be enhanced by identifying thoughtful, experienced, knowledgeable, and objective external reviewers.

The external disciplinary peer reviewer should be a highly knowledgeable academician and recognized leader in the field under review. Academic peer reviewers should understand university operations and graduate education and have the ability to realistically evaluate the program's strengths and weaknesses relative to similar programs at comparable institutions, the program's operations, plans for growth and development, and the professional activities of faculty members.

The external employer panelist should also be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in his/her field and should have a high degree of familiarity with the current and future needs for advanced degree employees in the field, be very knowledgeable about industry trends, and be familiar with graduates of the program and of similar programs.

If the Graduate Dean has approved conducting a graduate program review in conjunction with an external review, such as a Cooperative States Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) or accreditation review, the Graduate Dean may elect to appoint an external disciplinary peer member of the external review panel to the internal review panel. Thus, there is an external disciplinary peer member who serves in common on both reviews. Similarly, one of the internal graduate faculty Review Panel members may be invited to participate in the external review.

Expenses of the external reviewers, including travel, lodging, meals, any honorarium, and all other costs associated with the conduct of the review are the responsibility of the unit whose program is being reviewed. In some colleges, these costs are managed centrally in the dean's

office. Travel, lodging, meals & refreshments, and meeting room arrangements are made by the program.

The Dean of the Graduate School appoints the remaining internal members of the Review Panel. Internal members of the Panel should be from colleges other than that of the program under review. Whereas internal Panel members may vary in their familiarity with the subject matter of the program, all should be well versed in the practice of graduate education.

Site Visit Following review of the self-study report the Review Panel will conduct a site visit of the program. The site visit is typically one day in length, but may be extended if deemed desirable by the Panel or program or if another review is involved. The schedule and agenda of the site visit will be developed by the Graduate School in consultation with the director of the program being reviewed. Arrangements for scheduling participants and for locating space are the responsibility of the program in consultation with the Graduate School.

The visit includes interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty, staff, graduate students, and others as appropriate. The program director does not participate in the separate interviews other than his/her own session with the Review Panel. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. It is helpful to schedule time with students early in the day so that the Panel can further examine any issues or concerns that may be raised by students over the course of the day's agenda. Additional materials may be requested by the Panel and reviewed at this time if appropriate. Time should also be arranged for any faculty or staff member or graduate student who wishes to have a private meeting with the Review Panel. The Panel usually observes the research and instructional facilities of the program.

The opportunity should be extended for additional feedback to the Panel after the site visit, to allow input from faculty and students who may not be present at the site visit or who may have follow-up comments. This data should be delivered to the Panel Chair no later than one week after the site visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit the Panel, in executive session, reviews its findings and discusses its sense of the review. This is a particularly important opportunity to capture the observations of the external reviewer(s). Following this discussion the Panel should agree upon format, content, assignments for preparing various components, and deadlines for completion of its formal report.

In addition, the college dean and/or the Dean of the Graduate School may wish to confer with the external reviewer prior to his or her departure.

The following is an outline of a typical site visit.

DAY ONE

6:00 - 8:30 pm Pre-review dinner with Graduate Dean and Review Panel

DAY TWO

8:00 - 8:45 am	Program Director
8:45 - 9:30 am	College Dean(s)
9:30 -10:15 am	Program committee(s) (e.g., admission committee, graduate committee)
10:15 -10:30 am	Break
10:30 -12:00 pm	Graduate students
12:00 -1:00 pm	Working lunch for Review Panel
1:00 - 1:45 pm	Facilities tour
1:45 - 2:45 pm	Program faculty
2:45 - 3:00 pm	Break
3:00 - 3:30 pm	Program committee(s), faculty, graduate coordinator, staff, as appropriate
3:30 - 4:00 pm	Program Director
4:00 - 5:00 pm	Executive session

Review Panel Report Based on the site visit and analysis of the materials presented in the self-study document, the Review Panel prepares a formal report of its findings within three weeks of the site visit (see outline, page 15). The report provides both evaluation and constructive recommendations and it is important to note that the final document will be public record. The report should address the quality, vitality, and direction of the program and the extent to which the program is achieving its stated mission and goals. It should also analyze and evaluate inputs, productivity, and outcomes by assessing specific indicators such as the quality of the students applying to and entering the program, the instructional and scholarly productivity of the faculty, the program's commitment to diversity, the placement of graduates of the program, and the continued relevance of the graduate program.

The report should contain recommendations concerning the future of the program including its structure and scope of activities. These recommendations could range from a recommendation to discontinue a program to a recommendation to greatly expand its scope. A recommendation might be to change the direction, structure, or activities of the graduate program in order to improve its quality, increase its effectiveness, or to utilize the University's resources more efficiently.

The initial draft is submitted by the Panel Chair to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean of the Graduate School will submit the draft report to the program director for review of errors in factual content. Corrections of fact suggested by the program director are submitted to the Graduate Dean who forwards them to the chair of the Review Panel. After factual information has been confirmed the final report is submitted by the Review Panel Chair simultaneously to the Dean of the Graduate School and to the program director. It is the responsibility of the director to provide a copy of the report to the college dean(s) and others as appropriate.

Consideration of the Review Panel Report The chair of the Graduate Council will arrange for the report to be presented at a regular meeting of the Graduate Council where it is formally considered. The program director and academic college dean(s) will be invited to the Graduate Council meeting to comment on the report. The Council may accept the report as distributed, accept the report with revisions, or send the report back to the Review Panel for further work prior to final action. After the Graduate Council has accepted the report, the report is forwarded by the Graduate Dean to the Provost.

Action Plan An action plan should be prepared by the program director specifying timely, positive measures to address each of the Review Panel's recommendations to improve program quality. The Provost, the Graduate Dean, the academic college dean(s), a representative of the Graduate Council, and the program director meet to review and accept the action plan. The agenda for the meeting with the Provost includes a brief presentation of major recommendations by the Graduate Council representative, brief comments by the program director, brief comments by the college dean(s), followed by full discussion of the proposed action plan with the Provost. The meeting is scheduled for one hour. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Provost signs off on the action plan, specifying any additional issues to be addressed and actions to be taken. At an agreed upon date, typically three years later, the Graduate Council will conduct a follow-up review to determine if the planned actions have been implemented (see "Follow-up" section below).

Follow-up Annually, the Graduate Council appoints committees whose charge is to re-examine recent Graduate Council Program Reviews and the action plans that resulted, and determine from the responsible parties if the planned actions have been implemented. Reports of these follow-up reviews are shared with the Graduate Dean, who forwards copies to the program director, academic dean(s) and Provost. Follow-up review reports are approved by the Graduate Council. Outcomes of the follow-up review could range from a conclusion that the action plan was appropriate and its implementation is well under way to a recommendation that insufficient progress has been made and a need exists for further conversation among the program leader, college dean(s), Graduate Dean, and the Provost regarding the future of the program.

Program Checklist

FIVE YEARS IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- Program first notified of the academic year of the review.
- Program begins collecting data needed for completion of self-study (see appendices).

TWO YEARS IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- Program attends annual Graduate Council Program Review Workshop presented by the Graduate School.

SIX MONTHS TO ONE YEAR IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- Faculty in charge of writing self-study meet with Graduate Dean for guidance in preparing the self-study.
- Program conducts two surveys (see Appendices):
 - ___ survey of current graduate students
 - ___ survey of graduate alumni
- Graduate Dean provides program with data from its annual exit survey of degree recipients.

ONE TO TWO TERMS IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- Program nominates external reviewers (3 academic peers/3 prospective employers) and forwards names and contact information to Graduate Dean, including:
 - ___ complete name & title
 - ___ address
 - ___ telephone number(s)
 - ___ email address
 - ___ URL
- Program forwards site visit “black-out” dates (and preferred dates) to Graduate Dean.
- Graduate Dean establishes date of site visit.
- Program arranges external reviewers’ travel, lodging, and for payment of any honorarium, as necessary.
- Program works with Graduate Dean to establish site visit agenda.
- Program is responsible for scheduling site visit participants³, facility tours, locating space for the meetings, and for arranging meals and refreshments for the site visit.

TWO WEEKS IN ADVANCE OF THE SITE VISIT

- The program director (or department chair if appropriate) must sign off on the self-study cover sheet indicating that the program’s graduate faculty had the opportunity to participate in the document’s development or had an opportunity to review the final document.*
- Program forwards 9 (nine) copies⁴ of self-study to Graduate Dean who forwards them on to the Review Panel members.
- Program forwards copies of self-study to the college dean(s), program faculty, and others as appropriate.

³ Program Chair, faculty, staff, graduate students, others as appropriate.

⁴ Additional copies (+4) needed if undergraduate program review held concurrently.

THE DAY OF THE SITE VISIT

- Program makes available in meeting room one copy all faculty vitae (in binder).
- Program makes available in meeting room one copy all graduate course syllabi (in binder).
- Program participates in site visit and is on call to provide any additional information, attend to last-minute needs, etc.

THREE WEEKS AFTER THE SITE VISIT

- Initial draft of the Review Panel's report is forwarded to program by Graduate Dean.
 - Program responds to Graduate Dean with any corrections in factual content within one week.*

UPON COMPLETION OF REPORT

- Program receives Final Report from the Review Panel Chair.
- Program forwards copy of report to the College Dean(s) and others as appropriate.
- Graduate Dean submits report to the members of the Graduate Council for a 2-week review period.
- Report placed on the Graduate Council agenda.
- Report approved by Graduate Council.
- Graduate Dean forwards approved report to the Provost.
- Program begins preparing an action plan in response to the recommendations made in the final report.
- Graduate Dean schedules the date of the "Provost's Meeting" to discuss the report and to review the program's action plan.
 - Program must forward the completed action plan to the Graduate Dean at least one week prior to Provost's Meeting.*
- Program Director attends the "Provost's Meeting" along with the Provost, Graduate Dean, College Dean(s), and a representative of the Graduate Council to review and accept the action plan.

THREE YEARS AFTER THE REVIEW

- Graduate Council conducts a follow-up review to determine progress toward implementation of planned actions.

Guidelines for Graduate Council Program Reviews: Information for *Reviewers*

General Overview The Graduate School has responsibility for the quality of graduate programs at Oregon State University. Following a standard format, reviews of graduate programs are conducted through the Graduate Council. Graduate Council Program Reviews involve the preparation of a full self-study, a one day site visit by a panel of reviewers, and the approval of a formal report by the Graduate Council. The purpose of the review is to identify positive suggestions for enhancing the quality of graduate programs at Oregon State University.

Self-Study Document The primary benefit of the program review process lies in the opportunity for self-analysis and the use of this analysis along with the report of the Review Panel in subsequent program enhancement. Thus, a major component of the program review process is the process involved in the preparation of a self-study document which serves as the primary source of information for the Review Panel.

The program director (or department chair if appropriate) is responsible for guiding the preparation of the self-study and assembling data and materials pertinent to the review. The self-study document should be prepared in close collaboration with the faculty, students, staff, and leadership of the program unit. The program director is responsible for insuring that all graduate faculty members have an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study or have an opportunity to review the final document. **A representative from the Graduate Council will review the self-study document and may elect to cancel or postpone the Graduate Program Review if the document is not received by the agreed deadline and/or if the document lacks essential content.**

The Review Panel The Review Panel is appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Graduate Dean works with the program director to identify external panelists, and with the chair of the Graduate Council to assign Graduate Council panelists. The Review Panel is composed of one member of the Graduate Council, two additional members of the OSU Graduate Faculty, at least one external academic disciplinary peer, and at least one prospective employer of degree recipients. Additional external panelists may be desirable. Usually, the external academic disciplinary peer member of the Review Panel is designated to chair the Panel. When a Graduate Council Program Review is held in conjunction with an outside agency review, a representative of the Graduate Council is appointed Panel Chair. The Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School accompany the Review Panel during the site visit to observe and participate in the review.

To form the Panel, the Graduate Dean solicits nominations of external reviewers from the program director. The nominees should include a minimum of three academic peers and a minimum of three prospective employers. It may be appropriate for some programs to submit the names of people in academia as prospective employers because most of the graduates of their programs find employment as faculty members in academia.

Generally *not* considered for appointment to the Review Panel are former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members, former OSU students, former OSU employees, individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU, or individuals from

institutions substantially different in character from OSU who will be less likely to understand local circumstances. The Graduate Dean may consult with the academic dean regarding the selection of reviewers from among those nominated. The credibility of the review will be enhanced by identifying thoughtful, experienced, knowledgeable, and objective external reviewers.

The external disciplinary peer reviewer should be a highly knowledgeable academician and recognized leader in the field under review. Academic peer reviewers should understand university operations and graduate education and have the ability to realistically evaluate the program's strengths and weaknesses relative to similar programs at comparable institutions, the program's operations, plans for growth and development, and the professional activities of faculty members.

The external employer panelist should also be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in his/her field and should have a high degree of familiarity with the current and future needs for advanced degree employees in the field, be very knowledgeable about industry trends, and be familiar with graduates of the program and of similar programs.

If the Graduate Dean has approved conducting a graduate program review in conjunction with an external review, such as a Cooperative States Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) or accreditation review, the Graduate Dean may elect to appoint an external disciplinary peer member of the external review panel to the internal review panel. Thus, there is an external disciplinary peer member who serves in common on both reviews. Similarly, one of the internal graduate faculty Review Panel members may be invited to participate in the external review.

Expenses of the external reviewers, including travel, lodging, meals, any honorarium, and all other costs associated with the conduct of the review are the responsibility of the unit whose program is being reviewed.

The Dean of the Graduate School appoints the remaining internal members of the Review Panel. Internal members of the Panel should be from colleges other than that of the program under review. Whereas internal Panel members may vary in their familiarity with the subject matter of the program, all should be well versed in the practice of graduate education.

Pre-review Dinner The Graduate Dean will meet with the Review Panel over a working dinner the evening prior to the site visit. The self-study document will be reviewed, and the Dean will advise the Panel on review procedures. Significant issues to be examined during the site visit will be identified. During this meeting, the agenda of the on-site visit will be reviewed, and individual Panel members will be assigned responsibility for specific topics of inquiry and for preparation of sections of the written report. If the college dean has requested of the Dean of the Graduate School that attention be given to specific aspects of the program, that information will be presented for incorporation.

Site Visit Following review of the self-study the Review Panel will conduct a site visit of the program. The site visit is typically one day in length, but may be extended if deemed desirable by the Panel or program or if another review is involved. The schedule and agenda of the site

visit will be developed by the Graduate School in consultation with the director of the program being reviewed.

The visit includes interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty, staff, graduate students, and others as appropriate. The program director does not participate in the separate interviews other than his or her own session with the Review Panel. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. It is helpful to schedule time with students early in the day so that the Panel can further examine any issues or concerns that may be raised by students over the course of the day's agenda. Additional materials may be requested by the Panel and reviewed at this time if appropriate. Time should also be arranged for any faculty or staff member or graduate student who wishes to have a private meeting with the Review Panel. The Panel usually observes the research and instructional facilities of the program.

The opportunity should be extended for additional feedback to the Panel after the site visit, to allow input from faculty and students who may not be present at the site visit or who may have follow-up comments. This data should be delivered to the Panel Chair no later than one week after the site visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit the Panel, in executive session, reviews its findings and discusses its sense of the review. This is a particularly important opportunity to capture the observations of the external reviewer(s). Following this discussion the Panel should agree upon format, content, assignments for preparing various components, and deadlines for completion of its formal report.

In addition, the college dean and/or the Dean of the Graduate School may wish to confer with the external reviewer prior to his or her departure.

The following is an outline of a typical site visit.

DAY ONE

6:00 - 8:30 pm Pre-review dinner with Graduate Dean and Review Panel

DAY TWO

8:00 - 8:45 am	Program Director
8:45 - 9:30 am	College Dean(s)
9:30 - 10:15 am	Program committee(s) (e.g., admission committee, graduate committee)
10:15 - 10:30 am	Break
10:30 - 12:00 pm	Graduate students
12:00 - 1:00 pm	Working lunch for Review Panel
1:00 - 1:45 pm	Facilities tour
1:45 - 2:45 pm	Program faculty
2:45 - 3:00 pm	Break
3:00 - 3:30 pm	Program committee(s), faculty, graduate coordinator, staff, as appropriate
3:30 - 4:00 pm	Program Director
4:00 - 5:00 pm	Executive session

Review Panel Report Based on the site visit and analysis of the materials presented in the self-study document, the Review Panel prepares a formal report of its findings within three weeks of the site visit (see outline, page 15). The report provides both evaluation and constructive

recommendations. The report should address the quality, vitality, and direction of the program and the extent to which the program is achieving its stated mission and goals. It should also analyze and evaluate inputs, productivity, and outcomes by assessing specific indicators such as the quality of the students applying to and entering the program, the instructional and scholarly productivity of the faculty, the program's commitment to diversity, the placement of graduates of the program, and the continued relevance of the graduate program. It is essential that all Panel members agree upon the structure and nature of the report, and the responsibility for preparation of each section. **The preparation of the draft and final version of the report are the responsibility of the Panel Chair.**

The report should contain recommendations concerning the future of the program including its structure and scope of activities. These recommendations could range from a recommendation to discontinue a program to a recommendation to greatly expand its scope. A recommendation might be to change the direction, structure, or activities of the graduate program in order to improve its quality, increase its effectiveness, or to utilize the University's resources more efficiently.

The initial draft is submitted by the Panel Chair to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean of the Graduate School will submit the draft report to the program director for review of errors in factual content. Corrections of fact suggested by the program director are submitted to the Graduate Dean who forwards them to the chair of the Review Panel. **After factual information has been confirmed the final report is submitted by the Review Panel Chair simultaneously to the Dean of the Graduate School and to the program director.**

Consideration of the Review Panel Report The chair of the Graduate Council will arrange for the report to be presented at a regular meeting of the Graduate Council where it is formally considered. The program director and academic college dean(s) will be invited to the Graduate Council meeting to comment on the report. The Council may accept the report as distributed, accept the report with revisions, or send the report back to the Review Panel for further work prior to final action. After the Graduate Council has accepted the report, the report is forwarded by the Graduate Dean to the Provost.

Action Plan An action plan should be prepared by the program director specifying timely, positive measures to address each of the Review Panel's recommendations to improve program quality. The Provost, the Graduate Dean, the college dean(s), a representative of the Graduate Council, and the program director meet to review and accept the action plan. The agenda for the meeting with the Provost includes a brief presentation of major recommendations by the Graduate Council representative, brief comments by the program director, brief comments by the college dean(s), followed by full discussion of the proposed action plan with the Provost. The meeting is scheduled for one hour. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Provost signs off on the action plan, specifying any additional issues to be addressed and actions to be taken. At an agreed upon date, typically three years later, the Graduate Council will conduct a follow-up review to determine if the planned actions have been implemented.

OUTLINE FOR THE REVIEW PANEL REPORT

1. Overall Recommendation:

- ⊃ Expand
- ⊃ Maintain
- ⊃ Restructure
- ⊃ Reduce
- ⊃ Suspend
- ⊃ Discontinue
- ⊃ Other _____

2. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

This section serves as an executive summary of the review report. A narrative style is common, but a bulleted list of key issues and findings may be useful. It summarizes all the major recommendations found in the body of the main report. This section generally does not exceed two pages in length.

3. Detailed Findings

This is the main body of the report. As such, it identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the program and provides a rationale for each point. It provides the details of the review findings and the basis for each recommendation. The report may be organized such that specific recommendations are interspersed throughout the narrative of the report, but the recommendations should be highlighted in some manner so they may be easily identified. The subsections of the report may vary depending upon the unit and nature of the program being reviewed. A typical report includes the following sections:

Introduction: Objectives of the review, participants, order of events, and organization of the report

Inputs:

- The fit of the mission of the program and its relationship to the mission of the academic college(s), and University mission.
- Quality of students
- Admissions selectivity
- Level of financial support of students
- Curriculum strength
- Quality of personnel and adequacy to achieve mission and goals
- Level and quality of infrastructure
- Quality of organizational support

Productivity:

- Level and quality of student performance
- Level and quality of faculty performance
- Viability of scholarly community within which students can interact

Outcomes:

- Professional viability of graduates
- Satisfaction of students and graduates
- Rankings/ratings

Conclusion:

Review Panel Member Checklist

AT LEAST ONE TERM IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- Reviewer is nominated and appointed to the Review Panel.
- Graduate Dean establishes date of site visit, in consultation with the Review Panel members and the Program.
- External Panel members are contacted by Program for travel and lodging arrangements.

ONE WEEK IN ADVANCE OF THE SITE VISIT

- Panel members receive copy of Program self-study from Graduate Dean.

THE NIGHT PRIOR TO THE SITE VISIT

- Review Panel members meet with Graduate Dean over a working dinner.

THE DAY OF THE SITE VISIT

- Panel members participate in site visit.
- Review Panel meets in executive session to review its findings and agree upon format, content, and assignments for preparing the various components of its formal report. Date for delivery of report to Graduate Dean also determined.

WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF THE SITE VISIT

- Review Panel Chair submits an initial draft of the Panel Report (see outline, page 15) to the Graduate Dean who forwards it to the program for review of errors of factual content.
- Review Panel Chair makes any needed corrections and submits the Final Report to the Graduate Dean and the program simultaneously.
 - Panel Chair must sign off on the Final Report cover sheet, indicating that the document received full Panel agreement. Cover sheet should also indicate overall Panel recommendation.⁵*

UPON COMPLETION OF REPORT

- Graduate Dean submits report to the members of the Graduate Council for a 2-week review period.
- Report placed on the Graduate Council agenda.
- Report approved by Graduate Council.
- Graduate Dean forwards approved report to the Provost.
- Graduate Dean schedules the date of the “Provost’s Meeting” to review the Program Action Plan.
- The Provost and the Graduate Council representative receives copy of Program Action Plan at least one week prior to Provost’s Meeting.

⁵ Overall Recommendations: expand, maintain, restructure, reduce, suspend, discontinue, other...

- The Graduate Council representative attends the “Provost’s Meeting” along with the Provost, Graduate Dean, College Dean(s), and Program Director to review and accept the Action Plan.

THREE YEARS AFTER THE REVIEW

- Graduate Council conducts a follow-up review to determine progress toward implementation of planned actions.

Appendix I OUTLINE FOR THE SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT

The following outline indicates the content that is essential to the self-study. Additional information is appropriate if it will enhance the effectiveness of the presentation of the quality of the graduate program. Materials that do not relate to the objectives of the program review process should not be included. **The document should not contain information on employees or students that is considered confidential or restricted.** The document should be tabbed into appropriate sections to aid the Review Panel in locating information.

THE SELF-STUDY		
PRE-TEXT PAGES		
	Cover page	List name of graduate degree program to be reviewed. List all participating departments.
	Table of Contents	
	Sign-off sheet	Include signature of program director (or department chair if appropriate) indicating that all graduate faculty members had an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study or had an opportunity to review the final document.
INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT		
This section should answer the question, “ <i>Why do you offer the program?</i> ”		
	Brief history of program	Provide a brief background or history of the program to establish the review context.
	Mission statement	Explain how the program mission relates to the college and university missions. Indicate the unique role of the program within Oregon and beyond.
	Goals	List major long and short-term goals of the program. Include current strategic plan and diversity plan as appendices.
	Current challenges/issues	List issues that are confronting the program.
	Review goals	Identify the questions the program faculty hopes to have answered as a result of the program review.
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION		
This section should answer the question, “ <i>What do you do?</i> ”		
	Characteristics of students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entering GPA of admitted & matriculated students (Model Table A) • GRE scores or other scores (e.g. GMAT) and comparison to national statistics (Model Table A) if available • TOEFL scores (Model Table A) • Honors/awards received by applicants & current students (Model Table F) • Number of students by degree sought, gender, ethnicity, residency (Model Table B)
	Admissions selectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant/matriculation ratio as per Model Table A • Program admissions criteria • Diversity recruitment strategies • Program admissions process/procedures • Include recruiting material as an appendix
	Financial support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellowships & scholarships awarded and selection process (Model Table C)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistantships awarded (Model Table C), selection process, comparison to national statistics • Proportion of students supported
	Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include 1 copy of all graduate course syllabi in a separate binder to be delivered along with self-study document • Learning outcomes for each graduate course • Graduate course list (Model Table D) • % graduate only & differentiation criteria within slash courses • Core requirements (if any) • Rankings (if any) • Graduate seminar syllabus (past 3 years) • Opportunities for internships, practica, etc. • Opportunities for community engagement • Graduate distance & continuing education activities • Policy/procedures regarding academic & research integrity • Include graduate student handbook as an appendix to the self-study document
	Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate faculty FTE (Model Table E) • Graduate faculty to graduate student ratio as per Model Table E • Distribution of graduate activities among faculty members (Model Table E) • Support staffing
	Facilities and budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of library holdings and services⁶ • Research and instructional facilities and equipment • Faculty and student office space • Financial resources available to support the program
	Organizational support	Include organizational chart.
PRODUCTIVITY		
This section should answer the question, “How well do you do what you do?”		
	Student Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student honors & awards at OSU (Model Table F) • Scholarly presentations, publications, exhibits, performances, etc. Identify major professors and/or committee members in bold/caps • Grants and contracts • Time to degree and attrition data (Model Table G)
	Faculty performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include 1 copy of faculty vitae in a separate binder to be delivered along with the self-study document • Faculty honors & awards • Scholarly presentations, publications, exhibits, performances, citations, invited talks, etc. Identify graduate student co-authors in bold/caps • Grants and contracts • Graduate student advising and thesis load per faculty member (Model Table E) • Professional service and leadership

⁶ Upon request, the OSU Library will provide a two to four page summary of library collections and services supporting the graduate programs under review.

OUTCOMES

This section should answer the question, “*What difference does it make whether you do what you do or not? How do you know?*”

	Professional viability of graduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theses/dissertations (Model Table H) • % employed at time of degree (Model Table I) • % positions directly related to degree • Types of positions, employment sectors • % who pass licensure/certification/professional exams and comparison to national statistics
	Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results and interpretation of current student survey • Results and interpretation of Advanced Degree Recipient Exit Survey • Results and interpretation of survey of alumni
	Rankings/ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRC, US News, disciplinary rankings, etc. and comparison to peers • Disciplinary accreditation and other reports

TRENDS AND FORECASTS

This section should answer the question, “*Do your students, faculty, university, or disciplinary trends demand that you do something different?*”

	Current trends	
	Implications for program quality	

SUMMARY

This section should answer the question, “*What have we learned from the program review process and what is our plan for moving forward?*”

	General summary	
	Self-recommendations	List recommendations for enhancing program quality based on analysis and interpretation of the self-study document

**SAMPLE
SIGN-OFF SHEET**

In signing this document, I indicate that all graduate faculty members in the program have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this self-study and review the final document.

John Q. Bean, Graduate Program Director

Date

Associate Professor

Peter Okra, Department Head

Date

Professor

Model Table A
APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS

ACADEMIC YEAR			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Number of Applications			34				
Admitted			14				
Gender	Male		8				
	Female		6				
Citizenship	Domestic		4				
	International		10				
Degree	Master's		10				
	Ph.D.		4				
Average GPA			3.56				
Average GRE (verbal)			533				
Average GRE (quantitative)			672				
Average GRE (analytical/analytical writing)			635				
Average TOEFL ⁷			603				
Rejected			18				
Gender	Male						
	Female						
Citizenship	Domestic						
	International						
Degree	Master's						
	Ph.D.						
Average GPA			3.56				
Average GRE (verbal)			533				
Average GRE (quantitative)			672				
Average GRE (analytical/analytical writing)			635				
Average TOEFL			603				
Withdraw			2				

⁷ Please indicate TOEFL type: computer-based (CBT), paper-based (PBT), or Internet-based test (iBT).

application/refused offer						
	Gender	Male				
		Female				
	Citizenship	Domestic				
		International				
	Degree	Master's				
		Ph.D.				
	Average GPA		3.56			
	Average GRE (verbal)		533			
	Average GRE (quantitative)		672			
	Average GRE (analytical/analytical writing)		635			
	Average TOEFL		603			
Matriculated			5			
	Gender	Male				
		Female				
	Citizenship	Domestic				
		International				
	Degree	Master's				
		Ph.D.				
	Average GPA		3.56			
	Average GRE (verbal)		533			
	Average GRE (quantitative)		672			
	Average GRE (analytical/analytical writing)		635			
	Average TOEFL		603			

Model Table C
GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT⁸

STUDENT⁹	MAJOR PROFESSOR	FUNDING SOURCE	APPOINTMENT TYPE
Student 1	Bean	NSF IGERT	GRA
Student 2	Okra	Phi Kappa Phi Nat'l Grad Fellowship	FELLOW
Student 3	Bean	Oregon Laurels Graduate Scholarship	SCHOLAR
Student 4	Carrot	NSF G-K 12	GRA
Student 5	Corn	NOAA Fisheries	GRA
Student 6	Okra	Department Instruction/NIH	GTA/GRA
Student 7	Potato	USDA Crop Disease	GRA
Student 8	Tomato	NIH Vaccine	GRA
		NSF Grad K-12 Teaching Fellowship	GTA

⁸ Data from previous three years at least.

⁹ Do not identify student(s) by name.

Model Table F
GRADUATE STUDENT HONORS & AWARDS

AWARD	YEAR	STUDENT¹¹	RECOGNITION
Selected PKP Membership	2005-06	Student 1	Plaque and cash.
Frolander Outstanding GTA	2006-07	Student 2	Certificate
Council of Graduate Schools Outstanding Thesis	2007-08	Student 3	Cash and trip to Nat'l meeting

¹¹ Do not identify student(s) by name.

Model Table G
DEGREE COMPLETION

Entering student academic year cohort*	Number of entering doctoral students	Number of entering master's students	Number of students who left the program without a master's or doctoral degree	Number of students who left program immediately after receiving a master's degree	Number of students admitted to doctoral candidacy**	3 years [≤ 3 Years]	4 years [> 3 ≤ 4 Years]	5 years [> 4 ≤ 5 Years]	6 years [> 5 ≤ 6 Years]	7 years [> 6 ≤ 7 Years]	8 years [> 7 ≤ 8 Years]	9 years [> 8 ≤ 9 Years]	10 years [> 9 ≤ 10 Years]
2004													
2005													
2006													
2007													
2008													
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* By cohort, we mean students entering a doctoral program during a given academic year (summer, fall/winter, spring).

If your program does not distinguish between those seeking a master's and those seeking a doctorate, please check here: _____

Model Table H
THESES/DISSERTATION TITLES

YEAR	NAME	DEGREE	MAJOR PROFESSOR	TITLE
2004	Apple	M.S.	Bean	A Study of <i>Myxobolus cerebralis</i> in the Lostine River, Oregon: Epizootiology, Distribution and Implications for Resident and Anadromous Salmonids
2004				
2005				
2005				
2006				
2006				
2007				
2007				
2008				

Appendix II
SAMPLE CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

It is the policy of OSU to conduct regular reviews of graduate programs. These reviews are intended to lead to constructive action to enhance program quality. As part of the Graduate Council review of your academic unit, we are interested in the opinions of graduate students regarding various aspects of graduate education.

Please read each item carefully and circle the number that best describes your viewpoint. All of your responses will be kept confidential. The questionnaire should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

	Agree Strongly				Disagree Strongly	
1. The research facilities that are available to me for my graduate research meet my needs.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Support equipment (such as computers) needed for my research is available to me.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. I have adequate access at OSU to facilities and equipment needed for my graduate work.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. The quality and availability of graduate student office space is adequate for my needs.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. OSU library resources available to me are adequate for my needs.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. The program offers an adequate selection of graduate courses, sufficient for timely completion of a full graduate program.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Graduate courses are taught at an appropriate graduate level and are of sufficient rigor.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. The graduate teaching by program faculty is of appropriate quality.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Graduate courses in other fields, needed to support my program or minor, are sufficiently available from other OSU departments.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Graduate program examinations are administered fairly.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Program seminars are adequate to keep me informed of developments in my field.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
12. The initial advising I received when I entered the program was an adequate orientation.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

	Agree Strongly				Disagree Strongly		
13. I have a mailbox or another appropriate form of communication with program faculty and graduate students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
14. I have adequate access to my major professor.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
15. I am receiving the research and professional development guidance I need.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
16. I am satisfied with the professional interaction with my major professor.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
17. I am treated as a respected contributor to the research program in which I am involved.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
18. I have been given an opportunity to be engaged in significant research for my thesis.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
19. If I decided to change my major professor, the program mechanism for doing so is suitable.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
20. The treatment in this program of graduate students in the following categories is equitable and appropriate consideration is given to their distinctive needs:							
20a. domestic minority students	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
20b. women students	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
20c. international students	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
20d. students with special needs/disabilities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
21. The program informs me of adequate opportunities for professional development and contacts outside OSU, such as attendance at professional meetings.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
22. Graduate teaching or research assistantship stipends in this program are adequate.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
23. The program offers adequate opportunity for its graduate students to gain teaching experience.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
24. Of those graduate teaching assistantships under central program control, assignments are made equitably, based on established criteria.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
25. Graduate program policies are clearly defined and readily available to me in a current handbook.	5	4	3	2	1	NA	

26. Graduate program policies clearly identify petition and appeals procedures available to me.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
27. There is a well-established mechanism for regular graduate student participation in program decisions affecting students, whenever this is appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

The following items are designed to help us interpret the responses of students in your program. However, providing this information is strictly optional.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>28. What degree are you pursuing?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master's thesis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> doctoral</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> other</p> | <p>29. How far along are you in your program?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1st year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2nd year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2+ years</p> |
| <p>30. What is your age?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 20-25</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 26-30</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 31-40</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 41+</p> | <p>31. What is your gender?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> male</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> female</p> |
| <p>32. What is your citizenship?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> USA</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> non-USA</p> | <p>33. Are you a person of color?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> no</p> |

Do you have any concerns about this graduate program that you would like to share with the review team?

What do you consider to be the major strengths of this program?

How did you find out about the program?

Why did you choose this program?

What changes, if any, could the program leaders make to improve the quality of graduate education?

Appendix III
SAMPLE GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY

OSU GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY

1. What graduate degree(s) did you earn from OSU¹³? (Circle all graduate degrees earned).

Questions 2-16 refer to the last graduate degree you earned at OSU.

2. From which department/program(s) did you earn your degree?

3. What was your major field of study for your degree? _____

4. What was your area of concentration within your major(s)? _____

5. What was (were) your minor field(s) of study?

6. In what year did you complete your last graduate degree at OSU? _____

7. Which three of the following best describe your reasons in seeking a graduate degree at OSU? (Rank your top three reasons with 1 = most important, 2 = next in importance, etc.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> To get a promotion at a job | <input type="checkbox"/> To get research skills |
| <input type="checkbox"/> To retain a job | <input type="checkbox"/> To gain credibility in my profession |
| <input type="checkbox"/> To acquire an academic position | <input type="checkbox"/> To change my field/profession |
| <input type="checkbox"/> To gain expertise in content area | <input type="checkbox"/> For flexibility in job options |
| <input type="checkbox"/> To gain prestige of advanced degree | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) _____ | |

8. Using the following scale, please reflect on your graduate study at OSU and rate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your graduate school experience. (*Circle one number for each*)

	Unsatisfied			Satisfied		N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Departmental advising/guidance	1	2	3	4	5	6
Major professor mentoring	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overall quality of graduate instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6

¹³ Program should list the degrees it offers here.

Diversity and availability of graduate course offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professional relationship with graduate committee	1	2	3	4	5	6
Level of financial support	1	2	3	4	5	6
Resources available for student research	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overall satisfaction level	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. How many years did it take you to complete your degree? _____

10. Please rate the length of time it took you to complete your degree. (*Circle one letter*)

- a) Much longer than expected
- b) About the length of time expected
- c) Less time than expected

11. Were you a graduate assistant while enrolled as a student at OSU. (*Circle all that apply*)

- a) Yes, a teaching assistant, for _____ years
- b) Yes, a research assistant, for _____ years
- c) No.

12. Were there periods of time in which you needed to self-fund your education? If so, how long? (*Circle one letter*)

- a) No.
- b) Yes, for < 6 months
- c) Yes, for 6-12 months
- d) Yes, for 12-24 months
- e) Yes, for longer than 2 years

13. What level of indebtedness did you incur to support the completion of your graduate degree? (*Circle one letter*)

- a) \$0-\$10,000
- b) \$10,000-\$20,000
- c) \$20,000-\$30,000
- d) More than \$30,000

14. As a result of your graduate education, how prepared do you feel in your career or to move on to a more advanced degree program? (*Circle one letter*).

- a) Very prepared
- b) Somewhat prepared
- c) Somewhat unprepared
- d) Very unprepared

15. Would you recommend the program from which you graduated to a prospective student?

- a) Yes
- b) No

16. Please indicate whether or not you would select each of the following if you could start your graduate program again. (*Circle one answer for each*).

The same major	Yes	No
The same degree	Yes	No
The same major professor	Yes	No
Oregon State University	Yes	No

Reflecting on your experiences after you earned your degree, please answer questions 17-24.

17. After receiving your graduate degree from OSU, have you been enrolled in any educational program, either full or part-time? (*Circle one letter*)

- a) No (***Skip to question number 20***)
- b) Yes

18. Which best describes the educational program(s) you have enrolled in since receiving your graduate degree from OSU? (*Circle all that apply*).

- a) Graduate degree (Masters or Doctorate)
- b) Professional (Law, Medicine, etc.)
- c) Post-baccalaureate
- d) Apprenticeship or internship
- e) Seminars, courses, workshops, not part of a degree program
- f) Other _____

19. Please describe any additional degree(s) you have completed since leaving OSU.

Degree(s) _____
 Major(s) _____
 Date(s) of completion _____
 University(s) _____

20. From the following list, please indicate which best describes your ***initial*** post-graduate activity following your graduate education at OSU. (*Circle one letter*)

- a) Graduate degree program at OSU or elsewhere
- b) Postdoctoral fellowship/traineeship
- c) Entering a postdoctoral program
- d) Tenure track faculty position at a college or university
- e) Non-tenure track faculty position at a college or university
- f) Faculty position in education but not in a college or university
- g) Research position in a college or university
- h) Research position in the private sector
- i) Research position in a research institute
- j) Professional contractor for services
- k) Position in business/industry
- l) Government position
- m) Self-employment

- n) Other position in a college or university
- o) Other position in the private sector
- p) Other (Specify_____)

20a. Was your **initial** graduate status/position directly related to your degree training?
(Circle one letter).

- a) Yes, it was directly related to my degree (go to 20b)
- b) It was somewhat related to my degree (go to 20b)
- c) It was not at all related to my degree (go to 21)

20b. How long did it take you to find employment related to your degree?
(Circle one letter)

- a) < 6 months
- b) 6 –12 months
- c) 12 – 24 months
- d) Longer than 2 years
- e) Not applicable

21. Which one of the following best describes your **current** employment status? (Circle one letter)

- a) Still in my initial post-graduate position (skip to question 19)
- b) Graduate degree program at OSU or elsewhere
- c) Postdoctoral fellowship/traineeship
- d) Entering a postdoctoral program
- e) Tenure track faculty position at a college or university
- f) Non-tenure track faculty position at a college or university
- g) Faculty position in education but not in a college or university
- h) Research position in a college or university
- i) Research position in the private sector
- j) Research position in a research institute
- k) Professional contractor for services
- l) Position in business/industry
- m) Government position
- n) Self-employment
- o) Other position in a college or university
- p) Other position in the private sector
- q) Seeking employment
- r) Unemployed but not seeking employment
- s) Other (Specify_____)

21a. Is your **current** graduate status/position directly related to your degree training?
(Circle one letter)

- a) Yes, it is directly related to my degree (go to 21b)
- b) It is somewhat related to my degree (go to 21b)
- c) It is not at all related to my degree (skip to question 22)

21b. How long did it take you to find employment related to your degree? (*Circle one letter*)

- a) < 6 months
- b) 6 –12 months
- c) 12 – 24 months
- d) Longer than 2 years
- e) Not applicable

22. If your current job is **not** related to your degree, please indicate whether each of the following is or is not a reason by making an “x” in the appropriate box.

	Is a reason	Not a reason
Salary in major field not adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Too few jobs available in major field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Became interested in another field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kept the position I had before starting the degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had training in another field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current position will lead to a job more directly related	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did not intend major to be job-related	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wanted to live in a specific geographical area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had to meet needs of other family members (spouse, children, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other reason (specify): _____		

23. Graduate degree Goals/Outcomes (*circle one number for each*).

	To what extent were the following outcomes accomplished during your graduate degree program?						How important is this outcome to your job or career?				
	A great deal		Not at all				Very important		Not important		
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Readiness for continued scholarship	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Readiness for professional leadership	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Professional writing skills	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Analytical expertise	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Research design skills	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Subject matter mastery	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of theory development	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of computer applications	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Interdisciplinary perspective	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of computer applications	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Oral presentation/competency	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Creativity	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5

24. Please make any additional comments about your graduate degree program in the space provided below.