

Policy on Periodic Graduate Program Reviews

(Approved by Graduate Council, February 18, 2009; revisions approved by the Graduate Council, April 11, 2012; additional revisions approved by the Graduate Council, May 1, 2018; approved by Dr. Alan Utter, Provost, May 9, 2018.)

History

On April 18, 2002, the Graduate Council passed the following policy: "Each TWU graduate program that is not regularly reviewed for professional accreditation will be reviewed on a five-year cycle." The main objective of periodic program reviews was to provide a mechanism for improving the quality of graduate programs at Texas Woman's University. Periodic program reviews gave faculty and academic leaders important information about the effectiveness of a program including its strengths, weaknesses, and contribution to the mission of the university. In addition, information about the efficiency of programs was provided. Results of program reviews were used to give direction, to set goals for the future, and to ensure that general academic plans and budget decisions were based on information and priorities which match closely those of the university. Information gathered in these reviews will be incorporated in the next SACS self-study. TWU began this process in the 2004-2005 academic year with a five year review cycle.

2012 Revision

On April 11, 2012, the Graduate Council responded to new legislation passed by the State of Texas for the review of existing degree programs (See TAC, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Rule 5.52) requiring a seven-year review cycle, as well as additional required elements. The new procedures are outlined below and the schedule for review is listed in Appendix A.

General Procedures

Notification of Department Review: About one year in advance of the review, the Dean of the Graduate School will notify the administrator of the academic unit (chair, director, or associate dean) and the academic dean of the college that a review has been scheduled. During the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the graduate degree program is to be reviewed, the administrator of the academic unit will meet with the Dean of the Graduate School who will explain the review process and establish a timetable. A timeline for the review is shown in Appendix B. The

administrator will be asked to begin making a list of names of qualified persons from outside of the state of Texas who might serve as external review committee members. Please see the section on Selection of External Reviewers for more detail about the external reviewer qualifications.

Gathering Preliminary Information: The academic unit will gather internal information with assistance from the Graduate School, the Office of Institutional Research and Data Management, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Finance and Administration, and the office of the dean of the graduate program to be reviewed. Each unit will begin to gather evidence of effectiveness during the summer prior to the academic year during which the program is to be reviewed. In general, the data should cover the past seven years.

Effectiveness in Achieving Student Learning Outcomes

Gather the last 7 years of academic institutional improvement reports.

Administrative Effectiveness and Productivity

- Number and type of degrees awarded
- Masters and doctoral semester credit hour production by major
- The number of majors in the department in the fall semester
- Demographics of applicants and enrolled students
- Average time for degree completion
- Test scores of students and applicants on GRE, GMAT and language proficiency exams
- GTAs, GRAs, scholarships, fellowships, and other awards to students.
- The Budget, faculty salaries and departmental operating expenses
- HEAF expenditures
- Faculty information
 - The number of full and part-time faculty by rank as well as graduate faculty membership
 - Research activities
 - Refereed publications and creative activities of faculty and program students
 - Citations in publications
 - Grants applied for by source
 - External and internal grants and contracts awarded by funding source
 - Work by faculty and program students in professional societies
 - Other academically relevant on-campus and off-campus service

A department may gather information from peer institutions as a part of their review.

Preparation of Self-study: The self-study document should follow the format shown in Appendix C. The administrator of the academic unit in which the degree program is located is ultimately responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study. The administrator may designate another faculty member or a team of faculty members to carry out the self-study, but should be continually and actively involved in overseeing the preparation of the self-study. All faculty members should be involved in the preparation of the self-study. The participation of enrolled students, alumni, and professional staff is highly encouraged. The self-study should be evaluative rather than simply descriptive. It should be more than just a collection of data, but a document of academic judgment about the effectiveness of the program, students' curriculum, resources, and future directions of the academic unit. The self-study should be one that assesses the academic unit's effectiveness in reaching goals, strengths, weaknesses, and needed actions.

Optional Internal Review Committee: The academic unit offering the degree program may choose to include an optional three member internal review committee in the program review process. Committee members must be full members of the graduate faculty. Internal review committee members cannot be from the academic unit of the program being reviewed, and no more than two can be from another academic unit in the same college. The other committee member should be from outside the college. The administrator of the academic unit would request members' service in the fall semester of the academic year during which the degree program will be reviewed.

Selection of External Reviewers:

Reviews of doctoral programs will require at least two external reviewers with subject-matter expertise who are employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas. External reviewers for doctoral programs must be provided with the materials and products of the self-study (see below) and must be brought to campus for an on-site review.

Reviews of master's programs will require at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution of higher education outside of Texas. The external reviewer(s) for master's programs must be provided with the materials

and products for self-study and may be brought to the campus for an on-site review or may be asked to conduct a remote desk review of the program.

External reviewers for either level must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline and must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review. The same reviewers and self-study materials may be used for programs with both a doctoral and a master's program under review simultaneously.

The Dean of the Graduate School will request member(s)' service in February of the year of review and will allot approximately six weeks from the request date to complete the external review.

Submission of Self-Study: The self-study should be forwarded electronically to the Graduate School no later than the second week in February of the academic year during which the academic unit is being reviewed. The Dean of the Graduate School will review the self-study document for content, completeness, and accuracy, and, if necessary, request that revisions be made by the department. The Graduate School will forward one copy of the self-study to the dean of the college, a copy to each member of the internal review committee (if applicable), and a copy(ies) to the external reviewer(s). Programs with external accreditation may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements.

Doctoral Program Review Required Elements: Criteria for the review of the doctoral programs must include, but are not limited to the following data covering the past seven years:

1. The required "18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs" detailed in Appendix D.
2. Student retention rates
3. Student enrollment
4. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable)
5. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
6. Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs
7. Program facilities and equipment
8. Program finance and resources
9. Program administration, and

10. Faculty qualifications

Master's Program Review Required Elements: Criteria for the review of the master's programs must include, but are not limited to:

1. Faculty qualifications
2. Faculty publications
3. Faculty external grants
4. Faculty teaching load
5. Faculty/student ratio
6. Student demographics
7. Student time-to-degree
8. Student publications and awards
9. Student retention rates
10. Student graduation rates
11. Student enrollment
12. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable)
13. Graduate placement (i.e., employment or further education/training)
14. Number of degrees conferred annually
15. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
16. Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs.
17. Program facilities and equipment
18. Program finance and resources, and
19. Program administration

The Review Process: The Dean of the Graduate School will meet with the review committee members during the third week of February of the academic year during which the academic unit is being reviewed. At this meeting, a committee chair will be elected from the three-member review committee, and instructions and advice on the review process will be given. By April 15, the review committee will submit its report to the Graduate School. Guidelines for the reviewers are detailed in Appendix E.

Assessment of Report: The Dean of the Graduate School will schedule a meeting to share results of the review no later than two weeks after receiving the assessment report. Attendance at this meeting will consist of the administrator of the academic unit offering the degree program, the dean of the college of the academic unit, the Dean of the Graduate School, a representative of the internal review committee (if applicable), and any other faculty selected by the

academic unit administrator. If the academic unit opted to select an internal review committee, the representative of the internal review committee will summarize the findings of the internal review committee. The Dean of the Graduate School will summarize findings of the external reviewer(s). The administrator of the academic unit and the dean will be given the opportunity to respond to the report of the review committee and to add any relevant information. A discussion will follow. The time allotted for the meeting will be approximately one hour.

Action of the Dean: After further consultation with the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School, the supervising dean will submit a brief statement outlining the follow-up steps to be taken based on the outcome of the review. This statement should be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School within fifteen days after this meeting, and a copy will be forwarded to the Provost.

Action of the Institution: Institutions shall submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s) and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Academic Affairs and Research Division of the Texas Higher Educating Coordinating Board not later than 90 days after the reviewer(s) has submitted findings to the institution.

Action of the Coordinating Board: The Coordinating Board shall review all reports submitted for master's and doctoral programs and shall conduct analysis as necessary to ensure high quality. Institutions may be required to take additional actions to improve their programs as a result of Coordinating Board review.

Follow Up: Approximately one year after the completion of the review of a department or program, there will be a meeting with the administrator of the unit offering the degree program, the dean of the college, and the Dean of the Graduate School to discuss the follow-up steps taken. The dean will provide written documentation of the changes made as a result of the review.

Appendix A: Schedule for Review of Graduate Programs

Texas Woman's University Graduate Program Review Schedule Submitted to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Academic Year **Fall 2012 - Summer 2013**

08/31/2013 BIOLOGY **Masters** 260101
08/31/2013 COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY **Doctorate** 422803
08/31/2013 MOLECULAR BIOLOGY **Doctorate** 260204
08/31/2013 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY **Masters** 512306
08/31/2013 PHYSICAL THERAPY **Special Professional** 512308
08/31/2013 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY **Masters** 422805
08/31/2013 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY **Doctorate** 422805

Academic Year **Fall 2013 - Summer 2014**

08/31/2014 ENGLISH **Masters** 230101
08/31/2014 GOVERNMENT **Masters** 451001
08/31/2014 HISTORY **Masters** 540101
08/31/2014 NURSING **Masters** 513801
08/31/2014 NURSING PRACTICE **Doctorate** 513818
08/31/2014 NURSING-ADMINISTRATION **Masters** 513802
08/31/2014 NURSING-CLINICAL NURSE LEADER **Masters** 513820
08/31/2014 NURSING-EDUCATION **Masters** 513817
08/31/2014 NURSING-PRACTITIONER **Masters** 513805

Academic Year **Fall 2014 - Summer 2015**

08/31/2015 ART **Masters** 500701
08/31/2015 CHEMISTRY **Masters** 400501
08/31/2015 DANCE **Masters** 500301
08/31/2015 DANCE **Doctorate** 500301
08/31/2015 DRAMA **Masters** 500501
08/31/2015 HEALTH STUDIES **Masters** 511504
08/31/2015 HEALTH STUDIES **Doctorate** 511504
08/31/2015 KINESIOLOGY **Masters** 310505
Page 1 of 3 Texas Woman's University 01/23/2012
08/31/2015 KINESIOLOGY **Doctorate** 310505
08/31/2015 MATHEMATICS **Masters** 270101
08/31/2015 MATHEMATICS-MATHEMATICS TEACHING **Masters**
131311
08/31/2015 MUSIC **Masters** 500901

Academic Year **Fall 2015 - Summer 2016**

08/31/2016 ADMINISTRATION **Masters** 130401
08/31/2016 BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION **Masters** 520201
08/31/2016 COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY **Masters** 422803
08/31/2016 HEALTH SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT **Masters** 510701
08/31/2016 HEALTHCARE ADMINISTRATION **Masters** 510701
08/31/2016 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY **Doctorate** 512306
08/31/2016 SPECIAL EDUCATION **Masters** 131001
08/31/2016 SPECIAL EDUCATION **Doctorate** 131001
08/31/2016 SPECIAL EDUCATION-EDUCATIONAL DIAGNOSTICIAN
Masters 131001
08/31/2016 TEACHER, LEARNING, AND CURRICULUM **Masters**
131202
08/31/2016 TEACHING **Masters** 130101

Academic Year **Fall 2016 - Summer 2017**

08/31/2017 CHILD DEVELOPMENT **Masters** 190706
08/31/2017 COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT **Masters** 131101
08/31/2017 EARLY CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION
Doctorate 190706
08/31/2017 EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION **Masters** 131210
08/31/2017 EXERCISE AND SPORTS NUTRITION **Masters** 510913
08/31/2017 FAMILY STUDIES **Masters** 190701
08/31/2017 FAMILY STUDIES **Doctorate** 190701
08/31/2017 FAMILY THERAPY **Masters** 511505
08/31/2017 FAMILY THERAPY **Doctorate** 511505
08/31/2017 FOOD SCIENCE **Masters** 190501
08/31/2017 FOOD SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION **Masters** 190505
08/31/2017 NUTRITION **Masters** 301901
08/31/2017 NUTRITION **Doctorate** 301901

Academic Year **Fall 2017 - Summer 2018**

08/31/2018 EDUCATION OF THE DEAF **Masters** 131003
08/31/2018 LIBRARY SCIENCE **Masters** 250101
08/31/2018 LIBRARY SCIENCE **Doctorate** 250101
08/31/2018 RHETORIC **Doctorate** 231304
08/31/2018 SOCIOLOGY **Masters** 451101
08/31/2018 SOCIOLOGY **Doctorate** 451101
08/31/2018 SPEECH/LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY **Masters** 510203

Academic Year **Fall 2018 - Summer 2019**

08/31/2019 *BIOLOGY-BIOLOGY TEACHING 2014 **Masters** 260101

08/31/2019 *CHEMISTRY-CHEMISTRY TEACHING 2014 **Masters**
400501

08/31/2019 *EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION **Doctorate** 131210

08/31/2019 *GOVERNMENT **Doctorate** 451001

08/31/2019 NURSING SCIENCE **Doctorate** 513808

08/31/2019 *NURSING-CLINICAL SPECIALIST 2013 **Masters**
513813

08/31/2019 *OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY-REHABILITATION
TECHNICIAN **Masters** 512306

08/31/2019 PHYSICAL THERAPY **Masters** 512308

08/31/2019 PHYSICAL THERAPY **Doctorate** 512308

08/31/2019 READING EDUCATION **Masters** 131315

08/31/2019 READING EDUCATION **Doctorate** 131315

08/31/2019 *SCIENCE TEACHING 2014 **Masters** 131316

08/31/2019 WOMEN'S STUDIES **Masters** 050207

08/31/2019 WOMEN'S STUDIES **Doctorate** 050207

*Currently in phase out period. Will be phased out prior to review date.

Appendix B: Timeline for Reviews

One year in advance of the review:

The administrator of the academic unit and the academic dean of that college are notified by the Dean of the Graduate School that a review has been scheduled.

Summer semester prior to the review:

The Dean of the Graduate School will meet with the administrator of the academic unit to explain the review process and establish a timetable. The academic unit will begin preparing the program review document and collecting data representing the last 7 years of activity. The academic unit will also suggest external reviewers for the unit. After approval by the dean of the college and the Dean of the Graduate School, the unit administrator will contact the external reviewer(s) in order to secure their services.

Fall semester during review year:

Preparation of the self-study document will begin. The external reviewers (and an optional three member internal review committee) will be selected.

Second week of February during review year:

Deadline for one copy of the self-study to be forwarded to the Graduate School and the internal review committee, if applicable.

By April 1:

The external reviewer(s) will submit their report(s) to the Dean of the Graduate School, who will share the report(s) with the internal review committee, if applicable.

By May 15:

The administrator of the graduate program being reviewed and the dean of that college will meet with the Dean of the Graduate School, the representative of the review committee, and others as appropriate to discuss the report. If the academic unit opted to select an internal review committee, the representative of the internal review committee will share the results of the committee's review. The Dean of the Graduate School will share the results of the external reviewer(s).

Within 15 Days of Meeting with Administrator of Academic Unit, College Dean, and Dean of the Graduate School:

The dean of the graduate program being reviewed will submit a statement outlining follow-up steps to be taken based on the program review.

By July 1:

Institution will submit the report of the outcome of the review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s) and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

One year after completion of program review:

The administrator of the academic unit and the dean of the college will meet with the Dean of the Graduate School to discuss the outcome of the follow-up.

Appendix C: Guidelines for Graduate Program Self-Study

Note: Include tables and charts as appropriate along with discussion of each item.

- I. Program Overview
Provide a one to two-page summary of department's mission and measurable student learning outcomes-for each graduate degree program. For doctoral programs, include the current "18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs."

- II. Assessment of Program's Institutional Effectiveness Plan
Each program has an academic institutional improvement (formerly institutional improvement) plan for measuring and monitoring achievement of student learning outcomes. The plan includes a regular cycle of measuring and monitoring all students' (as a group) achievement of program goals. Provide an assessment of how the program has monitored, measured, and made adjustments to the program based on student success in reaching measurable learning outcomes.

- III. Graduate Curricula and Degree Programs
Evaluate curricula and degree programs after consideration of the following data:
 - A. Alignment of courses/program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes.
 - B. Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs
 - C. The connection between the curriculum and current developments in the field

- IV. Faculty
Evaluate the contribution of the faculty to the program after consideration of the following data:
 - A. Faculty qualifications, including rank and demographics of the faculty, including graduate faculty status

 - B. Faculty publications and other scholarly/creative activities (provide citations as an appendix)
 - C. Faculty internal and external grants
 - D. Faculty responsibilities and leadership in professional societies
 - E. Faculty teaching load
 - F. Faculty/student ratio

V. Graduate Students

Evaluate the success of students in completion of degree programs after consideration of the following data:

- A. Student enrollment
- B. Student demographics including test scores (GRE, GMAT, and/or language proficiency exam), GPAs, and university of previous degree
- C. Student retention rates
- D. Number of degrees conferred annually
- E. Student graduation rates
- F. Student time to degree
- G. Student publications and awards (including fellowships,, scholarships, and leadership in professional organizations)
- H. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable)
- I. Graduate placement (i.e., student employment or further education/training)

VI. Department

Evaluate the administrative effectiveness and efficiency of the department after consideration of the following data:

- A. Program administration
 - 1. Credit hour production by level within the administrative unit
 - 2. Course offerings and enrollments
- B. Program facilities and equipment (including both teaching and research)
- C. Program finance and resources
 - 1. Department budget and operating expenses
 - 2. Faculty salaries
 - 3. HEAF support
 - 4. Financial support for graduate students
 - 5. Scholarships and endowments

VII. Analysis

Prepare a two- to three-page summary of the observed strengths and weaknesses identified by the program review. Highlight significant contributions to the University mission. Include a prioritized list of program needs and actions to be taken over the next seven years.

VIII. Appendices

The appendices should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- A. Course offerings in the program as listed in the catalog
- B. Recruiting materials for the program
- C. Graduate Student Handbook
- D. Information about program/department graduate student association(s)
- E. Description and information about program/departmental advisory boards

Appendix D: 18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs

The following chart represents the approved “Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs”.

18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs¹

¹ Programs included only if in existence three or more years. Program is defined at the 8-digit CIP code level.

² First-year doctoral students: Those students who have matriculated as doctoral students with a doctoral degree objective.

³ For each academic year, the time to degree is defined as beginning the year students matriculated with a doctoral degree objective until the year they graduated.

⁴ Definition of Full Time Student (FTS) is institutional by program.

⁵ Core Faculty: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.

⁶ All external funds received by core faculty from any source including research grants, training grants, gifts from foundations, etc., reported as expenditures.

MEASURE	OPERATIONAL DEFINITION
Number of Degrees Per Year	For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year
Graduation Rates	For each of the three most recent years, average of the percent of first-year doctoral students ² who graduated within ten years
Average Time to Degree	For each of the three most recent years, average of the graduates' time to degree ³
Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)	For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year employed, those still seeking employment, and unknown
Admissions Criteria	Description of admission factors
Percentage of Full-time Students	FTS ⁴ /number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters
Average Institutional Financial Support Provided	For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits)
Percentage Full-time Students with Institutional Financial Support	In the prior year, the number of FTS with at least \$1000 of annual support/the number of FTS
Number of Core Faculty⁵	Number of core faculty in the prior year
Student-Core Faculty Ratio	For each of the three most recent years, average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE)/average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty

Core Faculty Publications	For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries filed/patents issued per core faculty member
Core Faculty External Grants	For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external funds per faculty, and total external funds per program per academic year ⁶
Faculty Teaching Load	Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty
Faculty Diversity	Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender, updated when changed
Student Diversity	Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program during the prior year
Date of Last External Review	Date of last formal external review, updated when changed
External Program Accreditation	Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed
Student Publications/Presentations	For the three most recent years, the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE

Appendix E: The Task of the Reviewers

The task of the reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of the quality and effectiveness of graduate programs. The following are important considerations:

- The overall quality and direction of the program
- The quality of faculty
- Students and the existence of policies and practices in support of them
- Curriculum offerings and program options
- The adequacy of staff support, physical facilities, library resources, equipment, research facilities, and the program budget.

The review committees are encouraged to focus attention on questions regarding the relationship of programs to the goals of the university. It is the task of the reviewers to single out those features of the program that merit special commendation, and to make recommendations where there is room for improvement.

The Executive Report: The findings and recommendations of the committee should take the format of a concise one to two-page executive summary. Overall observations, reputation, strengths/commendations, deficiencies/recommendations, and value of the program to the mission of the university should be included in this report. Specific recommendations should be made regarding what is needed to strengthen programs that have deficiencies, or perhaps what is needed to lift an outstanding program to the top of its discipline. Specific recommendations should also be made for each program in the event that additional resources are not available. Reviewers should rate the program under review and provide a graded assessment similar to the following:

- Commendable
- Satisfactory
- Less than satisfactory

Guidance for Reviewers

During the review of each graduate degree program, reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the program with respect to the areas listed below. Reviewers are encouraged to give a rating of less than satisfactory, satisfactory, or commendable for each area. Ratings of commendable should be reserved for areas of exceptional merit. Reviewers should not feel confined to the areas specified and can

examine and comment on other areas that they deem important to the review process.

Program Overview and Mission

Reviewers should examine the mission and organization of the academic unit, paying special attention to program planning, goals, and program size.

Student Learning Outcomes

Reviewers should examine the program's evidence that students have achieved the learning outcomes set by the program. In addition, the program should indicate how its monitoring and measuring efforts have resulted in program improvements.

Faculty Productivity

Factors to be considered are: faculty profile, faculty scholarship and awards, faculty teaching load, and faculty service.

Quality and Quantity of Graduate Students and Graduates

Factors to be considered are: student profile, student recruitment, student retention, placement of graduates, career success of former students, student productivity, and teaching/research assistant preparation and support.

Curriculum and Programs of Study

Factors that should be considered are: degree requirements, alignment of degree requirements with student learning outcomes, course offerings, frequency, areas of specialization, nature and type of qualifying/final exams, connection of curriculum with current developments in the discipline, and mechanisms which foster independent learning enabling the graduate to contribute to the profession and field of study. Reviewers should determine if the program is compatible with similar programs elsewhere.

Facilities and Resources

Determine if existing space, library resources, information technology, and support staff are adequate to support the program.