

PROGRAM REVIEW AT UNC-CHAPEL HILL

CONDUCTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

PROGRAM REVIEW MANUAL, REVISED OCTOBER, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW . . . 5

THE SELF-STUDY . . . 5

THE ON-CAMPUS VISIT . . . 5

 SELECTING THE TEAM . . . 5

 ELEMENTS OF THE REVIEW AND PREPARATION OF THE SCHEDULE . . . 6

 OTHER LOGISTICS OF THE ON-CAMPUS VISIT . . . 7

VIRTUAL VISITS . . . 8

THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM'S REPORT . . . 8

THE PROGRAM RESPONSE . . . 8

THE CLOSURE MEETING AND MEMO . . . 8

THE MIDPOINT REVIEW ... 9

II. INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING A SELF-STUDY . . . 9

COMBINED GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS . . . 9

PROGRAM OVERVIEW . . . 10

CURRICULUM . . . 11

FACULTY . . . 12

STUDENTS . . . 15

LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT,

 INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS . . . 16

THE FUTURE . . . 17

III. SELF-STUDY OUTLINE AND REQUIRED KEY ELEMENTS . . . 20

IV. FIGURES . . . 22

FIGURE 1: CURRICULAR MATRIX . . . 23

FIGURE 2: TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . 25

FIGURE 3: TEACHING ACTIVITIES/FACULTY MEMBER . . . 26

FIGURE 4: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS . . . 27

FIGURE 5: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS . . . 28

V. INSTRUCTIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION . . . 29

VI. SAMPLE CAMPUS VISIT SCHEDULES . . . 33

VII. COPY OF THE CHARGE LETTER . . . 41

PROGRAM REVIEW AT UNC-CHAPEL HILL

Conducted by the Office of the Provost and The Graduate School

“The primary purpose of all program reviews is the improvement of graduate programs . . . a strategy for improvement that is well-reasoned, far-seeing, and as apolitical as possible. . . the size and stability of a program, its future faculty resources and student market, its equipment and space needs, its strengths and weaknesses, and its contribution to the mission of the institution. . . It helps set goals and directions for the future . . . It is necessary to assure the continuing quality of graduate programs and identify ways to improve them. There is no adequate substitute.”

--Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs (Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools), p. 2-3

Program review is:

- Internal, initiated and administered by the university
- Evaluative, not just descriptive
- Forward-looking, directed toward program improvement, not simply assessment
- Based on academic criteria
- As objective and transparent as possible
- Independent of other reviews (e.g., accreditation, licensing), with recommendations directed to faculty and university administrators
- Intended to result in action – a plan to implement desired changes, if possible on a specific agreed-upon timetable

Program Review provides answers to the following kinds of questions:

- How well is the program advancing the state of the discipline or profession?
- How effective is its teaching and training of students?
- To what extent does the program meet the institution’s goals?
- How well does it respond to the profession’s needs?
- How is it assessed by experts in the field?
- How well does it assess student outcomes and take action to improve based on the assessment data?

--Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs, pp. 4-5

I. ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW

THE SELF-STUDY

- What do you do?

- Why do you do it?
- How well do you do it?
- What difference does it make whether you do it or not?
- How well does what you do relate to why you say you do it?

A complete description of the suggested substance of a program's self-study comprises Part II of this document, "Instructions for Implementing a Self-Study." The self-study process usually takes approximately a year to complete, and involves a significant amount of planning, meeting, data collecting, discussing, writing, reviewing, and editing. **It is strongly suggested that a schedule for various components of the review be developed early in the process in order to facilitate accountability and *avoid placing an inordinate amount of the work for the self-study on any one person or administrative office.*** Optimal implementation of the process is genuinely collegial, embracing all actors and perspectives.

The **FINAL FORMAT** of the self-study should ideally be electronic only via a website (e.g., Canvas, Sharepoint, or MS Teams with security rights given to all participants) or a combined master PDF that can be emailed to all participants, assuming these electronic versions are easily accessible, organized, and readable. The Graduate School should receive the self-study materials approximately **one month prior** to the scheduled start of the on-campus visit of the Program Review Team. The Graduate School will handle distribution to everyone involved in the review and archival activities.

If flash drives or printing must occur, eight copies of the self-study are to be delivered to The Graduate School. They should be bound or in ring binders, with a table of contents, and tabbed or otherwise easily identifiable sections; it is appropriate for appendices to be provided only on a flash drive.

THE ON-CAMPUS VISIT

SELECTING THE TEAM

The Program Review Team comprises two highly qualified individuals, external to the campus. An additional member from the UNC-Chapel Hill faculty is appointed to participate and is drawn from a discipline complementary to the program undergoing review. Criteria for selecting team members include a history of involvement and success in scholarship or research, and experience in both graduate and undergraduate teaching. Ideally team members will have some direct administrative experience (e.g., chair, director of under/graduate studies, center experiences) to enable a full review.

The program submits a prioritized list of proposed reviewers to The Graduate School, taking care to cover the different areas of expertise necessary to provide a complete and knowledgeable assessment of the program. Usually, these are faculty members from other academic institutions, who are well respected in the field, but without direct connection to the program. **Program alumni, former faculty (or those we have previously recruited), direct research collaborators, and former team members from past reviews are not appropriate choices and should not be submitted.** Occasionally, in fields in which certain kinds of technical expertise are critical, an industry or practitioner representative may be included.

The Graduate School reviews the proposed names, together with the program dean's office, and an agreement is reached on a priority list for extending invitations. Attention is given to selecting individuals from public institutions, where possible, and for maintaining diversity of reviewers and perspectives. The Graduate School takes responsibility for inviting individuals to participate and for appointing them to the team.

A team member is selected to serve as chair of the team and to act as a liaison between the team and the University. The team chair provides input into the development of the on-campus visit schedule (when necessary), coordinates the preparation of the team's report, and is responsible for submitting the final report to The Graduate School.

The Graduate School pays travel expenses (i.e., budget roundtrip ticket to/from home location with reservations made approximately two months in advance and hotel in Chapel Hill) and a modest honorarium for the two external team members. Unless flight times do not allow a return late-afternoon or evening on the final day of the review, The Graduate School cannot pay for additional hotel stays. If the program wishes to invite an additional reviewer, the invitation process remains as above, but the program assumes all of the costs of the extra team member. Exceptions to this policy can be requested for valid academic reasons (e.g., an attempt to cover all specializations in a large program) but are dependent on funds available in a given academic year.

ELEMENTS OF THE REVIEW AND PREPARATION OF THE SCHEDULE

After reviewing the self-study, the external team of reviewers visits the Chapel Hill campus to assess the program. This assessment is based in part on the self-study, with particular attention given to the strength of the instructional and research programs, and the resources available to the program. In programs where there is an undergraduate program, it is expected that the undergraduate, and graduate program where applicable, will each be evaluated on its own merits before an assessment of the program as a whole is made.

The on-campus visit opens with a working dinner where the team meets with the program chair and other program faculty members. The next day, there is a meeting with the review team, along with representatives of the Provost's Office, the Dean's office of the respective school, and The Graduate School. Representatives from the program being reviewed are

not present at the opening meeting. The visit closes with an exit interview with the team and this same group. The program chair, in consultation with the chair of the review team and The Graduate School, plans the remainder of the visit.

During their visit, the team typically interviews program faculty and students, and often alumni, as well as meeting with key external constituents or internal working groups. Unless there are specific requests by the team, it is at the program's discretion to determine how to select and group individuals for these meetings while keeping guidance from The Graduate School in mind. These participants may include directors of program degree programs (e.g., undergraduate, master's, doctoral), research groups, key committees, and/or representatives of other units or groups that play a critical role in the program's work. Depending on the size of the Program, it is advisable to build in opportunities for certain groups to meet with the Review Team alone (e.g., assistant professors, associate professors, graduate students, and the unit chair or director). A schedule of all individual, one-on-one meetings is not recommended, though the schedule may have one 20-30 minute "open session" for any individual drop-ins or provide a way for someone to contact the team individually if desired. Open blocks of writing time are not necessary to schedule, instead spending time while on site in active meetings gathering information. Program leadership should not be present at every session during the site visit. (See attached sample schedules.)

In some cases, it is appropriate for the team to visit off-campus facilities, e.g., the Institute of Marine Sciences in Morehead City (Department of Earth, Marine, and Environmental Sciences), Art Lab Facility and Hanes Art Center (Department of Art and Art History). The team may ask to examine sample student files, or dissertations and theses, or to review other additional material/data.

Social events should not be scheduled, as the team typically uses evenings to work, in order to produce the beginnings of a draft of its report by the end of the on-campus visit.

OTHER LOGISTICS OF THE ON-CAMPUS VISIT

Reviewers are asked to arrive on campus in time for a dinner the night before the start of the review. The on-campus visits usually last one full day, and most of a second day (depending on the size and complexity of the program being reviewed). Reviewers are usually able to depart from campus in early evening on the final day.

The unit being reviewed is expected to arrange to have the external team members met at the airport and taken to the airport for their return, and to handle all other transporting or escorting of team members to meetings, on-campus and off.

The Graduate School will pay for the welcoming dinner for the review team and up to three additional program representatives. The Graduate School will also pay for the breakfast meeting on the first day, dinner on the first full day for the review team only, and the

breakfast on the second day for the review team only. The program will assume the costs of other events (e.g., lunches, self-study preparation). **Note:** The Graduate School is unable to pay for alcoholic beverages; bills will be split at the restaurant and/or with journal entries afterwards.

A memo detailing the logistics and finances will be provided to each program as their review date nears.

VIRTUAL VISITS

It is possible to conduct site visits virtually, by choice or due to external factors such as public health or weather. If your program believes a virtual visit is appropriate please communicate with The Graduate School early in your planning. The guidance above for selection of team members and schedule preparations should be followed, with the exception that the schedule may be elongated over more days to accommodate virtual capabilities, more frequent breaks, and more sessions for the Review Team alone. Please see a compilation of [Best Practices for Virtual Review Experiences](#).

THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM'S REPORT

On the second day of the on-campus visit, the Program Review Team participates in an exit interview, making an oral report to representatives of the Provost's Office, the Dean's office of the respective school, and The Graduate School. The team is requested to have a written report to The Graduate School, detailing their findings and recommendations, within a month of their on-campus visit. The report should reflect an assessment of mission, curriculum, faculty, students, leadership, support and resources, and strategy for the future, and typically is ten to fifteen pages long. Most teams try to have a plan for drafting the report before they leave campus.

Once received by The Graduate School, copies of the report are forwarded to the program chair and to representatives of the Provost's Office and the Dean's office of the respective school. It is expected that the program chair will share the report with program faculty.

THE PROGRAM RESPONSE

The program chair facilitates the preparation of a written response to the Program Review Team's report, reflecting the deliberations of the faculty in response to the report, which is subsequently sent to The Graduate School. This step normally occurs 6-9 months after the site visit to allow time for program deliberation and to put recommendations in place. Once reviewed by The Graduate School, copies of the response are forwarded to the Provost's Office and the Dean's office of the respective school.

THE CLOSURE MEETING AND MEMO

After receiving the program's response to the Program Review team's report, The Graduate School schedules a closure meeting. Attending are the program chair (and others whom s/he may wish to involve), and representatives of the Provost's Office, the Dean's office of the respective school, and The Graduate School. The purpose of the meeting is for the program to discuss the report of the Program Review Team and the program's response, to provide an update on changes since the report and the response were written, to respond to questions, and to develop a shared understanding of the steps needed to address any concerns raised by the review, including improvement of the educational program. This meeting is the time when an agenda and action plan for the future are established.

The discussion at the closure meeting is captured by The Graduate School and serves as a reference for subsequent program reviews, and for any interim deliberations regarding program expansion or new initiatives.

THE MIDPOINT REVIEW

For many programs, approximately four years after the closure meeting is held, The Graduate School will conduct a midpoint review check with the program by requesting an update on the action steps identified. This step ensures continuous assessment and improvement of our academic units. The Graduate School will contact the program chair with additional information when it is time for the Midpoint Review. Occasionally, depending on the nature of the recommendations and action items, additional check-ins will be scheduled on alternate schedules.

II. INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING A SELF-STUDY

Please note that these instructions are intended to be a helpful guide in preparing the program self-study. There is scope for interpretation and program-level flexibility, particularly if certain data elements or thematic areas do not apply to a given program. **Please see the self-study outline on pages 20-21 for required key elements and use the following sections and questions as a guide for developing your program narrative.** Additionally, those data and themes that are routinely monitored and assessed within the program should be relied on whenever possible to ease new data collection and reflect continuous assessment best practices.

COMBINED GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Program review at UNC-Chapel Hill includes all levels of program – undergraduate only, graduate only, and graduate-undergraduate combined, where appropriate. A combined review of both graduate and undergraduate programs of a school, department, or curriculum offers the opportunity to evaluate each degree level within the context of its own needs, goals, and objectives, as well as within the context of the unit’s overall mission and strengths. When preparing the self-study in such a case, it is important to provide assessment and commentary on each degree level separately, wherever possible. This is done in order to conduct a meaningful evaluation of the teaching, research and training activities of each degree level on its own merits. Afterwards, an assessment of the programs together should focus on the dynamic relationship between the undergraduate and graduate degree levels. The combined review should also address the program’s effectiveness in representing the discipline on campus.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The program overview presents a comprehensive assessment of the program’s degree offerings, within the parameters of its stated mission, goals, and objectives, and its position within the history of the discipline (past, present, projected), as well as within the family of its peer institutions and research centers. This is an opportunity for the program to reassess itself, restating or modifying its mission and the consequent goals and objectives. This statement serves as the framework for the evaluation process. Specifically, the reviewers will be charged to assess whether the stated mission is realistic and feasible, and whether it meets the needs of the profession for both scholarship and research.

The following suggestions may help in developing this section:

MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

- State the unit’s overall mission and goals – as well as the distinct mission and goals of the graduate and undergraduate programs, if appropriate – and the objectives to achieve those goals. There should be reference to the program’s position within the university’s mission, including the role of the undergraduate major and minor in relation to the program’s other functions (graduate program, research mission, service courses and activities). A description of the program’s organization, and policies which guide its operations, is important to include and provide context.

Units with both graduate and undergraduate programs should organize subsequent materials into separate sections for each level, and then proceed to develop mission/goal/objective statements for each level, as well as for different degree programs within each.

NEED/DEMAND

- For each degree or area of concentration within a degree program, including the undergraduate major (if any), please provide evidence concerning the need and/or demand for the program. Metrics should include at minimum enrollments and degrees awarded in each degree program.

INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES

- Comment on the degree of rapport and exchange that exists with related programs, and on any means for encouraging students to take courses in other programs.
- Note joint faculty appointments, joint or dual degree programs, and participation by program faculty in curricula outside the program.
- Comment on the program's involvement in research centers and institutes.
- Include descriptions and evaluation of any agreements (informal as well as official MOUs) with foreign partners and international collaborations.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

- Summarize evidence that compares the quality of your program with those on other campuses within the state, the region, and the nation.

PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

- Include a synopsis of any previous evaluations or external accreditation reviews of the program. It is appropriate to include the previous program review report, response, closure memo, and midpoint as self-study appendices. Copies of these are on file in The Graduate School if needed.

CURRICULUM

The section on curriculum is to describe the design and requirements of all degree programs, and to correlate these with the educational goals and learning outcomes they are intended to achieve for the students – content knowledge, thinking and expression skills, and professional skills. If programs sponsor certificate programs, either for matriculated or off-campus/professional students, they should be discussed as a separate program in the report.

Learning outcomes and assessment reports for both undergraduate and graduate curricula are important to include and assess. Programs must submit their last three years of learning outcomes assessment reports as part of the self-study; please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for prior year reports if necessary.

Specifically, the reviewers will be charged to assess the curriculum in terms of the stated mission of the program and their understanding of the needs of the profession. They will

look at the breadth and depth of content, integration, opportunities for practice and research, and preparation for professional life in the 21st century. Among other things, they will look for balance between coursework and research for each concentration area, as well as balance between required and elective courses; the progression of courses, seminars, research opportunities, and integrative projects; the length and size of the program relative to its stated goals; the balance between graduate and undergraduate programs; and the timeliness of course offerings. Figure 1, “Curricular Matrix,” may help in developing this section.

For programs offering courses for General College students: Explain the program’s role in the university’s undergraduate general education program for non-majors. How do undergraduate courses that enroll general education students differ from those aimed predominately at majors or minors? How are faculty made aware of these differences? How does the program ensure that it offers general education courses in sufficient numbers to satisfy demand and to attract majors?

FACULTY

This section is to frame the discussion by the faculty and the program’s administration of the faculty’s strengths and areas of concern in research, teaching, mentoring/advising, service, and participating in professional, program/department, and university committees and activities. This would be accomplished by:

- Stating the goals for research, teaching, mentoring/advising, service, and participation in professional activities,
- Determining the means to assess how well these goals are being met, and
- Discussing how to improve in each of these areas.

The Program Review Team will be asked to look at faculty size, quality and distribution by field of expertise, in relation to your program’s stated mission, and to identify priority areas of scholarship and research. We will ask them to look at how the faculty portrait relates to the university’s commitment to maintain a diverse population (e.g., women, underrepresented populations). They will consider both student and faculty evaluations of teaching, as well as whether there are sufficient opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching skills. They will look at research strength as compared to that of faculties at peer institutions, and will assess whether faculty research is effectively integrated into their teaching.

We will ask them to review and evaluate mentoring policies and practices within the unit, including special emphasis on mentoring junior faculty as they prepare for tenure and promotion as well as graduate students (if applicable). They review the service and engagement of the faculty research and activities with the campus, state, nation, and

international communities. We will ask them whether faculty compensation and rewards are appropriate in comparison to peer institutions. Finally, they will take into account the morale of the faculty and collegiality within the program.

It may be useful to organize the information into sections addressing overall assessment, research activities, and teaching responsibilities:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FACULTY

The overall assessment would include descriptive statements, supported by both aggregate data and individual data:

- Begin with a brief assessment of the state of the faculty, including a description of its organization and committee activities, interactions among faculty of the various curriculum tracks/concentrations (if any), and a report of the results of faculty surveys conducted as part of the self-study. Include an assessment of faculty strengths and areas of concern.
- Provide data on faculty distribution over ranks, including relevant comments and assessment.
- Describe how the salary range at each rank in the program compares with that in the discipline at comparable institutions.
- Indicate the age distribution of the faculty, along with projected faculty retirements. What is the expected impact of these retirements, and what are the program's plans to address this impact?
- Comment on the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in the program's faculty. Note any significant trends in the last five years. Be certain to present the program's recruitment, retention, and support procedures for racial and ethnic minority faculty and other underrepresented populations within the program.
- Describe the program's promotion and tenure policies, including their clarity and transparency among faculty. As part of program review, the unit's promotion and tenure process should be reviewed and revised (if not already done so recently), described, and included in the self-study.
- An assessment by and of faculty with administrative responsibilities (e.g., chairs, deans, directors) – their role and their effectiveness – is encouraged.
- Provide a description and assessment of the mentoring policies and practices in the program, including faculty-to-faculty mentoring, faculty-to-student mentoring, and the quality of the chair's or dean's feedback to faculty via annual and third-year reviews.
- Include an **abbreviated** curriculum vitae for each faculty member which summarizes publications; honors and awards; participation in national and international societies and meetings; editorial responsibilities; university, regional, national and/or international committees; faculty and graduate student mentoring activities;

research grants and/or contracts during the past *five* years. Include CVs as an appendix at minimum.

FACULTY RESEARCH

State the research goals of the faculty in each program area, including standards of quality and quantity. What are the rewards and results of meeting or exceeding these goals? How do these goals compare to those of similar programs at peer institutions?

- Begin by describing arrangements for research or study leaves, or alternative means by which faculty are encouraged to broaden their perspectives and to renew their qualifications for teaching and research. Comment on the success of faculty in obtaining outside or competitive funding for leaves – Guggenheim, Fulbright, etc.
- Comment on faculty grants held in the program over the last *five* years.
- Describe the program’s mentoring and other efforts to assist faculty to improve their research skills and ability to secure external funding.
- Provide a précis of honors and distinctions of the faculty for the last *five* years.

TEACHING

Describe and discuss the program’s policies on teaching, (supplementing with data, as shown in Figure 2, “Teaching Activities,” and Figure 3, “Teaching Activities/Faculty Member”):

- Describe the policy for the distribution of teaching loads *during the most recently completed academic year*. Distinguish between the teaching of graduate and undergraduate courses when possible, but include both when applicable.
- Discuss the rationale for this policy, and how it responds to the program’s curricular goals.
- Describe who does the undergraduate teaching (if any) in the program. If graduate students teach undergraduate courses, describe the process by which they are selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated. Describe, and comment upon the adequacy of, the compensation they receive.
- Describe the program’s process for evaluating teaching, and explain the evaluations that are used. Present evidence regarding instructional effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations.
- Describe the program’s mentoring and other efforts to assist instructors (faculty and graduate students) to improve their teaching.
- State the program’s goals and policies for faculty advising/mentoring of graduate students, undergraduate majors and minors, and postdoctoral fellows, and describe how this is accomplished.

For each faculty member individually, indicate:

- # completed master's theses/papers chaired/advised last *five* years
- # completed dissertations chaired/advised last *five* years
- noncommittee involvement in supervision of doctoral students or postdoctoral fellows
- active involvement in improvement of undergraduate instruction/research
- whether s/he has undertaken course development work (developing new courses, revising courses, preparing new course materials), either independently or in conjunction with programs in the Center for Faculty Excellence, or received various course development awards. Please describe any significant achievements in detail.

STUDENTS

This section is to summarize data about and by the students in the program, for the most part separating the presentation for graduate and undergraduate students. The Program Review Team will be asked to assess the standards of the program's student scholarship and research, as well as the placements of graduates, as compared to peer institutions. They will consider the adequacy of student funding, the quality of advising and mentoring of students, student morale, student learning outcomes assessment results, average time to degree trends, career preparation activities, and the distribution of students in relation to the university's commitment to maintain diversity (e.g., women, underrepresented populations). They will talk with students and they will assess whether students feel that they can participate effectively to improve or revise the program.

To assist in preparing this section, there are several types of data the program can obtain, described in detail later in this manual. The program being reviewed should comment on the trends revealed by those data. Information can be obtained for the past five years and includes various configurations of data on enrollment; graduate applications and acceptances; credit hours generated; and degrees conferred.

You may want to present quantitative data in the format of Figure 4, "Demographic Profile of Graduate Students" and Figure 5, "Demographic Profile of Undergraduate Majors". Please note significant trends. In addition, the following descriptive information would be included:

- How does the program seek to ensure a hospitable environment for all of its students?
- Comment on the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in the program's graduate and undergraduate student populations. Note any significant trends in the last five years. Be sure to use multiple selection options for race and ethnicity to adhere to recent Department of Education changes in collecting these data.
- Present the program's recruitment, retention, support and placement procedures for underrepresented populations within the discipline.

- Describe the program's set of goals and expected outcomes for undergraduate and graduate education, measures that will enable them to tell how well these goals and outcomes are met, a description of the student learning outcomes assessment process, and examples of how assessment results have been used to improve the program in recent years.
- Describe the criteria by which graduate applicants are chosen for offers of admission.
- From what sources (e.g., federal funds, training grants, university awards and assistantships, program assistantships), and in what amounts, are graduate students supported financially? What proportions are currently supported, and what is the average rate of support/student? If 5-year data are available, please provide; otherwise note trends.
- Describe procedures for evaluating the progress of graduate students during the course of their training, including mentoring practices to provide feedback to students.
- Incorporate time-to-degree statistics and trends, including any efforts to streamline time-to-degree in recent years.
- Provide any available statistics and an analysis of those data for matriculated students who left before completion of their program. What steps have been put in place to increase overall retention or identify “attrites” earlier?
- Identify significant professional or intellectual contributions by students while in the program or after graduation/completion of training (e.g., faculty ratings, awards and honors, notable publications, and leadership roles in professional organizations)
- Provide a précis of initial post baccalaureate pursuits of undergraduate majors and minors. Are the program’s baccalaureate graduates well-prepared for graduate and/or professional studies and employment in their specialty? Are they aided in obtaining employment? If so, describe how.
- Describe career exploration and job search support services and activities within the program. Are graduate and undergraduate students encouraged to prepare for a variety of career outcomes?
- Provide a detailed record of the employment placement or further advanced studies of graduates upon completion of the program for the most recent *five* years, for each degree or area of concentration.
- Provide narrative and data on current and projected workforce demand, focusing on job growth in the field and how our programs are contributing to workforce needs in North Carolina and beyond.

In preparing this section, please obtain student input and evaluations of all phases of the program; this is accomplished through the use of program-generated assessment tools and student surveys and focus groups. Comment on the results of any such assessments.

Include a discussion of the impact of teaching by graduate student teaching assistants (GTAs) on the effectiveness of the undergraduate curriculum. Summaries and

representative samples of student comments are encouraged. Comment on the legitimacy of student criticisms.

LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT, INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The goal of this section is to assess the effectiveness of the program's governance and administration, and the adequacy, currency, and distribution of space, equipment, and support services, especially as related to achieving the program's stated mission.

LEADERSHIP

Describe the program's internal organization for governance and administration. Include an organization chart, if available.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Comment on the adequacy of staff support, or support of others that may be appropriate, indicating the financial base of this support and clearly delineating state versus nonstate support levels. This should include technical, clerical, secretarial, and administrative support.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Comment on the status and adequacy of physical facilities, including:

- physical space for teaching, research, and administration;
- instructional, research, and administrative equipment;
- library holdings both within the program and university wide;
- computer capacity available to the program from the campus and/or from other agencies.

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Delineate relationships with other academic and research units, both on our campus and with other universities and outside units.

THE FUTURE

The program is asked to engage in an intellectual five-to ten-year planning process, taking into account the self-study data generated. This section should also share with the review

team the vision that the program faculty and administration hold for the discipline. Where is the program going? Stimulate faculty dialogue and report both *majority* and *minority* views.

Discuss how the program integrates an ongoing assessment of its progress toward its stated goals into planning for the future. How does the program recognize its strengths and concerns, and how is this recognition translated into planning? Where applicable, delineate between undergraduate and graduate aspects of program planning.

The Program Review Team will be asked whether the program's plans for the future, and its new initiatives, are realistic, and reflect the needs of the discipline. They will be asked to provide insights as to significant new developments in education and/or research that they see as likely to occur in the next five to ten years, and to assess whether the program is positioned to capitalize on these developments. They will be asked for recommendations for program growth, retraction, and other changes.

In preparing this section, the program may wish to address the following questions (among others):

- What are the major disciplinary subspecialties represented in the program, and what are their strengths and the program's concerns regarding them?
- Which of these subspecialties are likely to remain vigorous, and which are likely to be de-emphasized in the future, especially as current faculty retire? Are there subspecialties that should be eliminated or merged with others?
- Develop and comment on student enrollment projections for each subspecialty.
- Are there subspecialties not currently represented in the program for which development should be initiated? If so, what resources would be needed to mount such initiatives?
- Given that the total faculty size at Chapel Hill is likely to remain fixed in the future, and that graduate student enrollment has historically been most influenced by the ability of a program to support its students, what do you project for the size of your program (faculty, staff, graduate students, undergraduate majors) in the next five years? . . . ten years? Explain. How does undergraduate enrollment affect the program?
- Are there specific resource needs, *other than* additional faculty slots and graduate student stipends, which might inhibit nourishment of current subspecialties or the initiation of new ones? Explain.
- Are there important curricular changes that are to be made, or which should be made, during the next five years? If so, what are the plans for their implementation?
- How can the quality of graduate and undergraduate education be improved? What steps would be of assistance in enhancing the quality of the program in comparison

to those of other programs in the state? The region, and the nation-both short-term and long-term?

- What are the plans to attract graduate students with higher academic qualifications than those presently enrolled in the program?
- What plans exist to attract highly performing undergraduate majors?
- What plans have been made to ensure and enhance racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in the graduate and undergraduate programs?
- How can the quality of mentoring in the program be improved? What policies could be implemented to assist junior faculty in their promotion and tenure activities? What best practices would aid in strengthening both faculty-to-faculty and faculty-to-student mentoring?
- Does the program have or intend to have a postdoctoral program that will prepare new doctorates from diverse backgrounds to enter and remain in the professorate?
- What plans have been made to recruit, support, and retain underrepresented faculty?

III. SELF-STUDY OUTLINE AND REQUIRED KEY ELEMENTS

THE FOLLOWING SHOULD BE USED AS A GUIDE FOR INCORPORATING ALL KEY ELEMENTS IN A SUCCESSFUL SELF-STUDY...

- PROGRAM OVERVIEW
 - MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES
 - NEED/DEMAND AND WORKFORCE GOALS
 - INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES
 - INTERINSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE
 - PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

- CURRICULUM
 - FIGURE 1, *CURRICULAR MATRIX*
 - EDUCATIONAL GOALS/SKILLS ACQUISITION: DOCTORAL PROGRAM, MASTER'S PROGRAM, UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR, UNDERGRADUATE MINOR
 - DEGREE REQUIREMENTS: DOCTORAL, MASTER'S, MAJOR, MINOR
 - ADVISING/MENTORING: DOCTORAL, MASTER'S, MAJOR, MINOR
 - LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT: DOCTORAL, MASTER'S, MAJOR, MINOR, CERTIFICATES (THREE YEARS OF REPORTS AT MINIMUM)

- FACULTY
 - OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FACULTY
 - FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS
 - DIVERSITY
 - MENTORING (FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENTS)
 - FACULTY RESEARCH
 - TEACHING
 - FIGURE 2, *TEACHING ACTIVITIES*
 - TEACHING LOAD BY RANK
 - IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING
 - FIGURE 3, *TEACHING ACTIVITIES/FACULTY MEMBER*

- STUDENTS
 - OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS
 - STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS
 - DIVERSITY
 - ADMISSIONS PRACTICES
 - CAREER PREPARATION SUPPORT AND PLACEMENT OF GRADUATES
 - FIGURE 4, *DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS (@ 5 YEARS)*
 - ENTERING STUDENTS
 - GRADUATING STUDENTS

- FIGURE 5, *DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS (@ 5 YEARS)*
 - ENTERING STUDENTS
 - GRADUATING STUDENTS

- LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT, INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
 - LEADERSHIP
 - ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT
 - FACILITIES & EQUIPMENT
 - INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

- THE FUTURE
 - CURRENT STRENGTHS
 - AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
 - ONGOING ASSESSMENT
 - DISCIPLINARY NEEDS

IV. FIGURES

Figure 1: Curricular Matrix

Figure 2: Teaching Activities

Figure 3: Teaching Activities/Faculty Member

Figure 4: Demographic Profile of Graduate Students

Figure 5: Demographic Profile of Undergraduate Majors

The figures and charts on the following pages are only a guide. Data and presentation may vary based on the program's findings and choices for what/how to present their results.

FIGURE 1: CURRICULAR MATRIX

	Doctoral Program	Master's Program	Undergraduate Major	Undergraduate Minor
<p>Educational Goals/Skills Acquisition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of content knowledge students are expected to master • Thinking, writing, and laboratory research skills students should acquire • Professional skills students are expected to acquire (e.g., teaching skills, presentation skills) • Mechanisms to achieve these goals • Mechanisms to determine when and how these goals are being met 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Degree Requirements</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the structure and requirements of the program, and relate these to the educational goals/skills acquisition listed above. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide course descriptions, frequency with which each course is offered, and enrollment data for each course during the past five years. Describe and explain any significant trends. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide any course enrollment statistics for the past <i>five</i> years that reflect attendance by undergraduate minors in the program. Describe and explain any significant trends. 				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate procedures by which thesis and dissertation proposals are reviewed and evaluated, including internal policies used to appoint committees for master's and doctoral students. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and policies that govern the administration of comprehensive examinations. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe other procedures for evaluating the progress of graduate students during the course of their training. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the program have an honors option? If so, describe its purpose, and the requirements for admission and completion. 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe where the program is placed with respect to the structure of programs nationally – on a continuum from highly structured to unstructured. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each degree, or area of concentration within a degree program, provide evidence concerning the need or demand for the program. 	☑	☑	☑	☑
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the program's process for course and program review and development. Explain how new developments in the discipline are integrated into course offerings. 	☑	☑	☑	☑
<p>Advising/Mentoring</p> <p>Describe and evaluate current procedures for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> student orientation advising mentoring <p>How and how often does the program evaluate the quality of these activities?</p>	☑	☑	☑	☑
<p>Learning Outcomes Assessment</p> <p>Describe or provide annual reports for recent topics assessed, their findings, and how they have been used or plan to use the results for program improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree programs (all levels, including Certificates) Evaluation methods Faculty support Future outcomes assessment plans 	☑	☑	☑	☑

FIGURE 2: TEACHING ACTIVITIES, 20__ - 20__ *

	Total	Prof	Assoc Prof	Asst Prof	Instructor	Fixed Term Full-Time	Fixed Term Part-Time	Graduate Student
Teaching Load								
Number & (%) of undergraduate courses taught/rank	#{(100%):							
Number & (%) undergraduate students taught/rank	#{(100%):							
Number & (%) of graduate courses taught/rank	#{(100%):							-
Number & (%) graduate students taught/rank	#{(100%):							-
Improvement of Teaching								
Number of faculty active in training and supervision of GTAs								
Number of faculty awarded undergraduate teaching prizes								
Number of faculty awarded other teaching prizes								
Number of faculty involved in teaching-award selection committees								

* From most recent, complete academic year (AY1) through four years prior to AY1
 ** Fixed-term positions comprise lecturer and equivalents – e.g., artist in residence, writer in residence, and any other faculty rank designations with the prefix qualifier “adjunct,” “clinical,” or “research.”

FIGURE 3: TEACHING ACTIVITIES/FACULTY MEMBER, 20__ - 20__ *

	# COMPLETED MASTER'S THESIS/PAPERS CHAIR/ADVISED	# COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS CHAIR/ADVISED	OTHER MASTER'S/DOCTORAL COMMITTEE SERVICE	NON-COMMITTEE SUPERVISION OF DOCTORAL STUDENTS/POSTDOC FELLOWS	# COMPLETED UNDERGRADUATE HONORS THESES CHAIR/READER	ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION **	UNDERTAKEN COURSE DEVELOPMENT WORK**
FACULTY							

* From most recent, complete academic year (AY1) through four years prior to AY1

** Describe significant achievements in detail.

FIGURE 4: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS, 20__ - 20__*

	AY1	AY2	AY3	AY4	AY5
ENTERING STUDENTS					
Mean GRE score (if relevant)					
Mean entering GPA					
Racial and ethnic distribution					
Gender distribution					
GRADUATING STUDENTS					
Number/Degree Awarded					
Length of time-to-degree for master's graduates					
Length of time-to-degree for doctoral graduates					
Details on employment placement or advanced study of graduates upon completion					

* From most recent, complete academic year (AY1) through four years prior to AY1

FIGURE 5: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS, 20__ - 20__*

	AY1	AY2	AY3	AY4	AY5
ENTERING MAJORS (IF DATA ARE KNOWN)					
Entering GPA					
Racial and ethnic distribution					
Gender distribution					
GRADUATING STUDENTS					
Number of graduating majors, and minors					
Mean graduating GPA					
Number graduating with significant honors, i.e., program honors, Phi Beta Kappa or other honorary societies, special awards					

* From most recent, complete academic year (AY1) through four years prior to AY1

V. INSTRUCTIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION

As part of the program review, The Graduate School requests that academic programs provide admissions, enrollment, and graduation statistics for the previous five academic years to show trends. Each program is able to obtain these data directly from various campus research resources.

Programs will need to obtain the following information:

1. Degrees Awarded Statistics
2. Enrollments in Program by Term and Demographics
3. Credit Hours by Term and Demographics
4. Course Enrollment by Term and Level
5. Admissions Statistics
6. Graduate Student Exit Survey Reports
7. Various other data elements as needed for supporting the self-study narrative
8. When possible, the data from the National Research Council's Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs or other national rankings specific to the discipline should be incorporated into your program self-study in the doctoral education sections.

Reports from The Graduate School, the University Registrar's Office, and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will be used to generate some of the information for Program Reviews. The Graduate School and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment can also work together to provide customized reports of data as needed. Below are the some additional websites that will be helpful.

Program Data Profiles

<https://datapfiles.unc.edu/>

Program Data Profiles Home

Introduction

The Program Data Profiles Home is a central location for all of the data profiles that are available on the website. The profiles are organized into categories and are available in both English and Spanish. The profiles are available in both English and Spanish.

- [Introduction](#)
- [About the Program Data Profiles](#)
- [Contact Us](#)

Tools


The Program Data Profiles Home is a central location for all of the data profiles that are available on the website. The profiles are organized into categories and are available in both English and Spanish. The profiles are available in both English and Spanish.

- [Graduate School Results to Offer](#)
- [Graduate School Exit Survey](#)
- [Time to Degree Dashboard](#)
- [Doctoral Alumni Career Pathways Survey](#)
- [Second Year Graduate Student Retention](#)
- [Fellowship Dashboard \(BETA version\)](#)
- [Degree Awarded Dashboard \(BETA version\)](#)
- [Demographic Dashboard \(BETA version\)](#)

© 2019 The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. All rights reserved. | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#)


Common Enrollment Reports

<http://registrar.unc.edu/reports/>



Comprehensive Class report in TarHeelReports

<https://tarheelreports.unc.edu/>



General University Statistics, Faculty Information, Student Information

<http://oira.unc.edu/>

The screenshot shows a Firefox browser window displaying the website <http://oira.unc.edu/>. The browser's address bar shows the URL, and the page title is "Home - Office of Institutional Research ...". The website header includes "UNC-Chapel Hill: Home | Directory | Departments | News | Calendar | Search" and "The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of Institutional Research and Assessment".

The main content area features a navigation menu on the left with the following items: Home, Facts and Figures, Planning and Decision Support, Institutional Effectiveness, What's New, Additional Resources, About Us, and Faculty and Staff Access. Below the menu is a search box with the text "Search this site" and a "Go" button.

The central content area is titled "Advancing the University through:" and includes the sub-heading "External Reporting, Planning Support and Institutional Effectiveness". It features a large image of a classical building with a dome. Below the image, the text reads: "The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) provides data and other types of information about the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to support institutional decision making and achievement of our vision of becoming the nation's leading public university." Below this text is another image showing a night view of a building and a sign for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

On the right side, there is a "Quick Links" section with the following links: Course Evaluations Online, Quick Facts Brochure (PDF), IPEDS Report, Common Data Set, Student Data, Retention and Graduation Reports, Faculty and Staff Data, Peer Comparisons, Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), WEAOnline, Assessment Resources, Budget Planning Reports, Organizational File, FAQ, and How to Use This Site.

At the bottom right, there is a "Did You Know?" section with the text "Over 80% of graduating Carolina seniors stated" and a small image of a building.

VI. SAMPLE CAMPUS VISIT SCHEDULES

Department of Physics and Astronomy
(College of Arts & Sciences)

Department of Health Policy and Administration
(School of Public Health)

School of Social Work

Times and dates will vary when scheduling current reviews.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE SCHEDULE**

Arrive: Sunday, March 24.

Designated faculty will pick up our guests. Early arrivals may be given a tour of TUNL on the way from the airport to campus.

xxxx 3:10p (US Air 891/Philadelphia)
xxxx 5:30p (US Air 2406/Philadelphia)
xxxx 6:39p (United 7882/Chicago)

8:00 Dinner in The Piedmont Room at the Carolina Inn Crossroads Restaurant with xxx, Chair and Professor xxx, Assistant Chair of the Physics and Astronomy Department.

Monday, March 25.

9-10 Charge Meeting
- Review Team
- Representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Sciences, and The Graduate School

Department to meet team and escort to Phillips Hall

10-10:15 Undergraduate Program (x et al.)
258 Phillips Hall

10:15-11:00 Meet with Graduate Students

11:00-11:45 Graduate Program (x et al.)

11:45-12:00 Department Staff (x et al.)

12:00-01:00 Catered Lunch

1:00-1:45 High-energy Physics (x, et al.)

1:45-2:30 String Theory (x et al.)

2:30-2:45 Meet with Chair

2:45-3:45 Nuclear Physics (x et al.)

3:45-4:15 Tour of Goodman Laboratory

4:15-5:15 Astronomy & Astrophysics (x)

5:15-6:00 Committee "Reflections"

6:30 Committee Dinner

Tuesday, March 26.

8:00-8:45 Committee Breakfast

8:45-9:15 Gravity Physics

9:15-10:00 CM Physics Labs Tour & Demos

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-11:15 Condensed Matter Physics

11:15-12:15 Questions from committee. Summary of actions from previous review. Needs and plans for the future.

12:15-2:00 Lunch & Discussions with departmental leadership

2:00-3:00 Exit Interview

- Review Team

- Representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Sciences, and The Graduate School

xxx to airport for 5:30p and 5:40p flights

xxx to airport Wednesday morning for 8:12a flight

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

Program Review and ACEHSA Accreditation Site Visit

*Note this sample schedule is longer than a typical visit as it included
both an accreditation visit and the program review*

Arrive: Sunday, October 28

6:30 PM Dinner, Carolina Inn, Blue Ridge Room

From the Department – xxx

For the Reviews – xxx

Monday, October 29

All meetings are in 1101F McGavran-Greenberg unless otherwise noted.

9:00 AM Charge Meeting
- Review Team
- Representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean's Office in the School of Public Health, and The Graduate School

Department to meet team and escort to Rosenau Hall

9:30 AM Meet with Dean
170 Rosenau Hall

9:55 AM Review of BSPH Program: xxx, PhD, presenting

10: 50 AM Review of MPH Programs: xxx, PhD, and xxx, PhD, presenting

Noon Lunch with Doctoral Students and Doctoral Alumni

1:30 PM Review of PhD Program: xxx, PhD, presenting

2:30 PM Meetings with area concentration faculty
Economics: xxx
Organization Behavior: xxx

Health Services Research: xxx

- 4:30 PM Program Review Executive Session
- 6:30 PM ACEHSA Site Visit Team Dinner and Executive Session
Location tba

Tuesday, October 30

All meetings are in 1101F McGavran-Greenberg unless otherwise noted.

- 8:00 AM ACEHSA Review Begins
Review of Department Mission, Organizational Structure, and Resources
- 9:00 AM Two-year Master's Degree Program Structure
- 10:00 AM Break
- 10:15 AM Departmental Core Courses – core course faculty presenting
HPAA 220, 240, 250, 260, 270, 281
- 11:20 AM Professional Development, Internships, and Career Placement – xxx, MSHA,
presenting
- Noon Lunch with Master's Students
- 1:00 PM School of Public Health Core Courses – core course faculty presenting
1:00 PM HPAA 144 (xxx)
1:15 PM HBHE 131 (xxx)
1:30 PM EPID 160 (xxx)
1:45 PM ENVR 101(xxx)
- 2:00 PM MHA Degree Core Courses – core course faculty presenting
HPAA 130, 155, 230, 241, 251
- 3:00 PM MSPH Degree Core Courses – core faculty presenting
HPAA 271, 272, 110, 125
- 4:00 PM Integrative Courses and Comprehensive Examination
HPAA 106, 390, 391
- 5:00 PM Meeting with Master's Alumni and Preceptors
Both site visit teams

6:30 PM ACEHSA Site Visit Team Dinner and Executive Session
Location tba

Wednesday, October 31

All meetings are in 1101F McGavran-Greenberg unless otherwise noted.

8:00 AM Site visitors meet with other faculty as needed

9:00 AM Site visitors meet with interdisciplinary program directors
9:00 AM Sheps Center for Health Services Research
9:15 AM Carolina Population Center
9:30 AM Pharmaceutical Policy and Evaluative Sciences
9:45 AM Program and Health Outcomes

10:00 AM Executive session
Lunch served at 11:30 AM

2:00 PM Exit Session for Program Review – Executive Assoc. Provost and Deans

3:30 PM Exit Session for ACEHSA Accreditation – Chair and faculty

**SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, DOCTORAL PROGRAM SITE VISIT
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE SCHEDULE**

Arrive: Monday, April 29

xxx, Doctoral Program Chair, will pick up team members at airport

xxx Sunday, Southwest (Baltimore), arrives 5:45 PM

xxx Monday, Northwest (1418), arrives 12:03PM

7:00- Dinner with: xxx (Interim Dean) and/or xxx (Associate Dean), xxx,
and Site Visit Team at Carolina Inn

Tuesday, April 30

9:00-10:00 Charge Meeting
- Review Team
- Representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean's Office,
and The Graduate School

School to meet team and escort to School of Social Work

10:30-11:45 Meet with Doctoral Committee, Room 302 (Dean's Conference Room)

12:00-1:30 Lunch with Faculty Teaching Doctoral Program Courses (DPC),
Crossroads Restaurant Lounge

1:30-2:30 Continue discussion with Doctoral Teaching Faculty and with xxx,
Room 302

2:30-3:00 Meet with Assistant Professors (xxx), Room 302

3:00-4:30 Meet with Doctoral Students (Room 532 – Fifth Floor Lounge)

4:30-5:00 Meet with School's Administrative Team (xxx) to discuss resources for
the Doctoral Program

5:00-5:45 Meet with Ph.D. graduates (xxx), (Room 302)

Dinner Site Review Team meets to discuss report (local restaurant)

Wednesday, May 1

8:00-9:00 Breakfast with xxx, former Dean and others requested by Site Team

9:15-10:30 Meeting between site team and faculty and students (teaming up for mentoring of teaching or research) Room 302

10:30 Meet with Dean

Lunch: Report out with School Leadership

2:00 Exit Interview
- Review Team
- Representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean's Office,
and The Graduate School

Flights Home

xxx 2:55 PM

xxx 4:05 PM

VII. COPY OF THE CHARGE LETTER PROVIDED TO THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM

September 1, 20xx

TO: Program Review Team

RE: Charge to the Program Review Team—Department of X
PROGRAM REVIEW: SEPTEMBER 19-21, 20xX
(CHAIR)

Dear «Greeting»:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as part of the Program Review Team for the UNC-Chapel Hill «Full_Program_Name» Program Review site visit. We appreciate the time you are devoting to assist us in our program improvement efforts at Carolina and hope that your time on campus is as rewarding to you as I know it will be for us. We write now to offer a few guidelines for your work as you prepare to review this Program.

REVIEW TEAM REPORT AUDIENCE AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

We ask the Team to prepare a report of its findings and recommendations to be submitted to the Dean of The Graduate School within one month of the scheduled site visit. It will be circulated to the Provost, the School's Dean(s), and the leadership, other administrators, and faculty of the Program. From past experience, we found that a report of ten to fifteen pages has been most helpful, but the Team is encouraged to be as thorough in its assessment of the Program as possible. The report should reflect an assessment of mission, curriculum, faculty, students, leadership, support and resources, and strategy for the future. Some guiding questions for each of these areas follow. Where reference is made to peer institutions, please bear in mind that we mean America's leading research universities.

THE MISSION FRAMEWORK FOR THE REVIEW

Assess the stated mission of the Program. Is it realistic and feasible? Does it meet the needs of the profession for scholarship, service, and research? Use the mission as the framework for assessing other components of the Program.

THE CURRICULUM ADEQUACY OF THE CURRICULUM TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE DISCIPLINE

For programs with both graduate and undergraduate curricula, please review in terms of the stated mission of the Program and your understanding of the needs of the profession. Look at the breadth and depth of content, integration, and preparation for professional life in the 21st century. Review the balance between required and elective courses; the progression of courses, seminars, research opportunities and integrative projects; the timeliness of course offerings; opportunities for

engagement and service; the outcomes related to student learning assessment; and any other factors you feel are relevant to constructing a strong curriculum. Feel free to make suggestions for additions or deletions in specific areas.

For graduate studies, consider the course structure and offerings for each program area; the size of the program; the balance between coursework and research for each program area; and the length and time to degree of the Program relative to its stated goals.

For undergraduate studies, consider the size of the program; requirements and student opportunities within the major; and the preparation for a professional career or further graduate study.

THE FACULTY TEACHING AND RESEARCH STRENGTHS OF THE FACULTY

Please review faculty size, quality, and distribution by field of expertise in relation to the Program's stated mission. Consider how the portrait of the faculty relates to the University's commitment to maintain a diverse population (e.g., gender, underrepresented populations).

Consider both faculty and student evaluations of teaching, as well as whether there are sufficient opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching skills. Look at the faculty's research strength as compared to that of faculties at peer institutions. Assess whether faculty research is effectively integrated into teaching. Provide opinions on opportunities for public service and engaged scholarship, where appropriate.

Consider the extent and adequacy of mentoring policies and practices, by reviewing the clarity/transparency of the Program's promotion and tenure policies. Please give us feedback on whether faculty compensation and rewards are appropriate in comparison to peer institutions. Take into account the morale of the faculty and collegiality within the Program. If funding levels were to change, which areas of scholarship and research should have priority?

THE STUDENTS QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE; CAREER PLACEMENT UPON GRADUATION

For programs with both graduate and undergraduate students, please assess standards of student scholarship and research as compared to peer institutions; student morale; and the placement of graduates. Consider the distribution of students in relation to the University's commitment to maintain diversity (e.g., gender, underrepresented populations).

For graduate students, consider the adequacy and types of student funding, the quality of advising and mentoring, and the opportunities for interaction with faculty. For undergraduate students, consider the major offerings outside the classroom, the quality of student advising, and the preparation for future careers. Talk to students to elaborate upon information from the self-study document you received; determine if students feel they can participate effectively to improve or revise the program.

**LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE
SUPPORT, FACILITIES, INSTITUTIONAL
RELATIONSHIPS**

ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES IN THE PROGRAM, SCHOOL,
AND UNIVERSITY; WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER
UNITS ON CAMPUS AND IN THE NATION

Assess the effectiveness of the Program's internal organization for governance and administration. Look at the adequacy, currency, and distribution of space, equipment, staff, and support services, especially related to achieving the Program's stated mission. Comment on the extent and effectiveness of relationships with other academic and research units, both on campus and in the larger disciplinary community. Include relationships in the local community, the state, nationally, and abroad.

THE FUTURE THE RATIONALE FOR, AND FEASIBILITY OF, THE PROGRAM'S PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Are the Program's plans for the future realistic, reflecting the needs of the discipline? What are the areas in which significant new developments in education and research are likely to occur in the next five to ten years? Assess whether the Program is positioned to capitalize on these developments. Do you have recommendations for growth, retraction, and other change? What specific recommendations do you have to strengthen our Program?

THE SELF-STUDY THE ACCURACY AND THOROUGHNESS OF THE PROGRAM'S SELF-STUDY

The Program's self-study documents were prepared following established guidelines to help the Program assess itself in light of its stated mission. Your package includes a copy of the review process as it was described to the Program. Consider the thoroughness of the Program's response to the guideline questions, the strengths and weaknesses of the Program's self-assessment, whether you have sufficient data to make recommendations, and whether the self-study not only *describes* the Program, but *evaluates* the Program as a basis for strategic planning. If there are gaps or absences, please note them.

We hope the provided materials will assist you in crafting a thorough and fair review of our Program. We ask that you treat all review documentation with professional courtesy, especially any sensitive or confidential information. The following materials are either enclosed in this mailing or can be reviewed online:

- A copy of your Travel Confirmation Memo
- Program Review Team Contact List
- Program Review Self-Study
- "Program Review at UNC-Chapel Hill" (or http://gradschool.unc.edu/program_review/)
- Graduate School Handbook (or <http://gradschool.unc.edu/handbook/>)
- The Graduate Record (<http://www.unc.edu/gradrecord/>)
- For additional information, please see: <http://gradschool.unc.edu/>

Thank you for agreeing to serve as chair of the Team; we appreciate your willingness to take on the task of facilitating the preparation of the Team's report. The final site visit schedule and your honorarium check will be included in the packet of materials held for your arrival at the Carolina Inn. We look forward to your arrival in a few weeks.

With all best wishes,
Dean, The Graduate School
Vice Dean for Academics, The Graduate School