

OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

EXTERNAL REVIEW MATERIALS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS 2

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT, DOCTORAL PROGRAMS..... 6

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT, MASTER’S PROGRAMS.....12

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM 20

ACCREDITATION IN LIEU OF EXTERNAL REVIEW 22

TIMELINE AND CHECKLIST FOR CONDUCTING GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS..... 23

Appendix A: Graduate Program Reviewer Report 25

Appendix B: Institutional Response Guidelines and Sample 28

OVERVIEW OF GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

In accordance with [Texas Administrative Code - Rule 5.52](#), the Graduate School requires all graduate degree programs to undergo review by an external review team once every seven years. Review materials must be submitted to the college/school dean, the Graduate School, UT System, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) on a schedule maintained by the THECB. These electronic submissions include a self-study report, external reviewer report, and the institutional response to the external evaluation.

A folder has been created in UT Box to support sharing of program data and review-related documents. The timeline and information provided here are designed to assist graduate programs in satisfying the external review and submission requirement.

1. Seven Months Prior to Semester of Review

The Graduate School sends an email notifying the graduate program that an external review is scheduled to take place during the next long term and providing a link to [online instructions](#) for preparing the self-study report. Most program data required for the self-study report is available in the Graduate Student Information System (GSIS) at https://utdirect.utexas.edu/apps/gsi/grad_reporting/review/. The Graduate School can provide historical program data to facilitate the early development of a self-study report; however, the report must be updated to include the most recent academic year's information prior to the site visit.

2. Six Months Prior to External Review Site Visit

The graduate program develops a rank-ordered list of 10 potential reviewers in consultation with the college/school dean and submits that to the graduate dean at graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu. Proposed reviewers should be tenured faculty from peer or aspirational peer programs and institutions.

The list should include each reviewer's name, current academic affiliation, CVs (detailing educational background, previous positions, leadership positions in the field, any administrative positions held and a list of grants and publications), and a brief statement about their professional/academic stature and why they should be selected.

Proposed reviewers should:

- Have a full understanding of the academic setting and the standards against which the program benchmarks itself,
- Be at arm's length from the program,
- Have outstanding scholarly credentials,

- Be recognized experts at public peer institutions. All institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) (<https://www.aau.edu/about/default.aspx?id=5476>) are acceptable peer institutions. Reviewers from non-AAU schools will be considered on an individual basis with adequate justification for their selection. Reviewers from private institutions may be proposed, but there is a preference for reviewers from public institutions that are more similar to UT in terms of state budget and compliance regulations.

Some programs wish to include individuals with differing areas of expertise on the review team. If so, please provide a ranked order list of reviewers within each identified areas of expertise. For example, Expert 1 (with required expertise in A). Backup 1, Backup 2; Expert 2 (with required expertise in B). Backup 1, Backup 2; etc.

The graduate dean, in consultation with the college/school dean, typically selects three external reviewers to serve on the review team for doctoral program reviews. Two are typically selected for Master's-only degree programs. A review team may review degrees in closely related fields of study when the reviews are scheduled to occur in the same semester. In such cases, the review team must generate a separate report addressing graduate degrees offered in each distinct field of study.

After the graduate and college/school deans identify the preferred membership of the review team, the Graduate School will send invitations to the proposed reviewers, including a deadline for response. The membership of the review team should be finalized no later than three months prior to the site visit. A slightly different selection and invitation process is followed by the College of Natural Sciences and the Moody College of Communication, both of whom review graduate degrees in the context of a broader departmental review.

The schedule of events for the site visit is set by the graduate program in consultation with the Graduate School and the college/school dean's office. Site visit dates must fall before April 30 for spring reviews or December 1 for fall reviews.

3. Forty-five Days Prior to External Review Site Visit

The department chair or program director provides the college/school dean with a draft of the full self-study report (and 1-4 page executive summary) including data and reporting requirements outlined by the Coordinating Board, the Graduate School, and the college/school dean. The college/school dean reviews the self-study report and recommends changes or additions, if any, to be incorporated into a final draft within two weeks. Detailed instructions for creating the self-study report begin on page 6 of this document.

4. One Month Prior to External Review Site Visit

The graduate program emails a description of the proposed student interview process to graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu for review by the graduate dean.

The college/school dean or their designate sends the external review team a final draft of the self-study report, including the 1-4 page executive summary. Copies of both documents are uploaded to UT Box for sharing with the graduate dean.

The graduate program coordinates and schedules the Welcome Meeting and the Final Exit Interview in consultation with their school/college dean's office and the Graduate School. Graduate programs must assess both deans' availability for the Final Exit Interview prior to scheduling or sending electronic meeting invitations. Programs should contact Executive Assistant Veronica Davis (veronica.davis@austin.utexas.edu) to confirm the Graduate Dean's availability.

- The Welcome Meeting is the first meeting of each site visit. In this brief (10 – 15 minute) meeting, Graduate Dean Sarah Ades welcomes the review team and outlines the University's objectives with respect to program improvement, reporting to the state, and implementation of recommendations. This meeting only includes the review team and the dean of the Graduate School.
- The Final Exit Interview is the final meeting of the program review, occurring only after all other meetings have concluded on the final day of the site visit. This meeting includes the review team, the college/school dean, Graduate Dean Sarah Ades and a member of the graduate dean's staff.

5. Site Visit Conducted as Scheduled

Site visits for fall reviews must occur prior to December 1. Site visits for spring reviews must occur prior to April 30. Programs should consider University holidays and the submission timeline when scheduling site visits. University holidays are published on the academic calendar at <http://registrar.utexas.edu/calendars>.

6. Fourteen (14) Days After the External Review Site Visit

The external review team submits the external reviewer report to the Graduate School and the college/school dean using the template provided in Appendix A. The college/school dean provides a copy of the external review report to the department chair/program director and emails a copy to the graduate dean at graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu.

7. Days 15-90 After External Review Site Visit

The department chair/program director develops and submits a written response to the external reviewers' report to the college/school dean's office and the Graduate School within

30 days of the site visit. The Graduate School schedules a meeting with the college/school dean to discuss the external reviewers' report and the response of the department chair/program director. The college/school dean prepares a first draft of the Institutional Response and emails it to graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu for the graduate dean's review. The graduate dean and college/school dean meet to discuss and finalize the Institutional Response no later than 90 days after the site visit.

8. 90-120 Days After Site Visit

The Graduate School forwards the full self-study report, the summary of the self-study report, the external review team report, external reviewer CV's, the draft Institutional Response, and any other related materials to the provost for approval.

9. 120 Days After Site Visit

The Graduate School submits the summary of the self-study report, the full report of the external review team, and the Institutional Response signed by the provost to the department chair/program director, UT System and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

10. Post-review Status Updates Reports

The Graduate School distributes requests for Status Update Reports every other year following an program review. These updates are shared with school/college deans on an annual basis and on request.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT, DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

Minimum required elements of the self-study report are listed below. The overall purpose of the report is to allow the program to be portrayed as accurately and completely as possible. To that end, programs should include information to clarify these required elements.

A draft of the self-study report, including a 1-4 page summary, must be submitted to the college/school dean for review 45 days prior to the external review site visit. Following any recommended revisions and 30 days prior to scheduled visit, the college/school dean or their designate submits the final version of the self-study report to the external review team and the Graduate School.

Programs that have recently undergone an external review for accreditation purposes may submit the review report in addition to, but not in lieu of, the self-study required here. (See p. 21 for additional information regarding accreditation reviews)

I. Graduate School Requirements

(A) Narrative Description: Provide a description of the doctoral degree program.

(B) If the program has recently developed a strategic plan, include the plan.

(C) Provide a statement regarding the ranking of the graduate program with peer institutions. Include data from ranking sources that are most relevant to your program. If ranking data are unavailable, include your program's interpretation of ranking among peer institutions.

(D) Competition: Identify graduate programs that represent the greatest competition for top-quality students.

(E) Competitive Advantage: Identify points of effective program strength vs. competitors.

(F) Competitive Disadvantage: Identify points over which the program loses top-quality students to competitors.

(G) Current Enhancement Efforts: Describe how the graduate program is currently pursuing improved excellence and competitiveness. This may be covered in the strategic plan if one is available.

(H) Selectivity Index: For the past five years, provide the percentage of total applicants who were admitted. (Please contact Shannon Neuse in GIAC for this data. shannon.neuse@austin.utexas.edu).

(I) Yield Index: For the past five years, provide the percentage of admitted students who enrolled. (Please contact Shannon Neuse in GIAC for this data. shannon.neuse@austin.utexas.edu).

(J) Current admissions process: Describe your current admission cycle/s and holistic admissions process. Indicate how many faculty serve on the program's admissions committee and describe what role/s each member fulfills. Describe how test scores are used in the selection process. Describe how your program has or has not been effective recruiting students of different backgrounds, considering both applications and yield.

For the past three years, describe how many requests for conditional admission have been submitted and how many have been approved. Describe the basis of these requests; e.g., applicant lacking final transcript with bachelor's degree at the time of graduate admission. Describe differences in success rates for conditionally admitted students as reflected in relative graduation rates and time to degree.

(K) Teaching effectiveness of graduate faculty: Describe how you assess the teaching effectiveness of your graduate faculty. Describe any strategic plan for improving teaching effectiveness. In addition, note any faculty who are Provost's Teaching Fellows (<https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/meet-fellows>), any teaching awards, or other teaching honors, given to your graduate faculty.

Course & faculty assessment data gathered before fall 2022 via Course Instructor Surveys (CIS) are available at <https://utdirect.utexas.edu/ctl/ecis/results/index.WBX>. Instructions for analyzing CIS results are found at <https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/analyze-cis>. Assessment data gathered after summer 2022 via Course Evaluation Surveys (CES) are available at <https://utexas.bluera.com/utexas/rpvlf.aspx?rid=62d6f5ef-fcf8-4227-9f6a-68ff24f4daec®l=en-US>.

(L) Graduate certificates: Describe any transcript-recognized graduate certificates offered, noting if the certificates are delivered on a formula-funded (Option I) or non-formula-funded (Option III) basis. Include application, enrollment, and completion data for the past five years. Indicate if the certificates are available to degree- or non-

degree-seeking students. Describe the impact of certificate programs on related degree programs and their students.

(M) Texas Extended Campus: Describe any graduate-level courses offered through Texas Extended Campus. Indicate if the courses are available to degree- or non-degree-seeking students. Describe if the courses are intended for use in satisfying background requirements or if they are being applied in satisfaction of doctoral program requirements. Describe the impact on degree-seeking students, faculty and staff. Describe any impact the delivery of courses through Extended Campus has on the program's budget or revenue.

(N) Program updates since last external review: Using the program's most recent Status Update Report (provided by the Graduate School) as a point of reference, describe actions that have been taken in response to external reviewer feedback to improve program quality .

(O) Program reviews of student progress: Describe the program's process for conducting annual reviews of student progress and communicating the results of these reviews to students.

(P) Referring to data provided in Item J, Current Admissions Process, describe the program's success in meeting the academic needs of students from different backgrounds. On request, the Graduate School will provide assistance assembling data on time to degree and graduation rates to supplement the information or assessment provided in this section.

II. Coordinating Board Requirements: The data for many of the required elements of the self-study report will be available through the Graduate Student Information System (GSIS) at https://utdirect.utexas.edu/apps/gsi/grad_reporting/review/. The graduate program is responsible for including this information in the self-study report.

1. Number of Degrees Per Year – For each of the three most recent years, the number of degrees awarded per academic year. (Provided in GSIS)

2. Graduation Rates – For each of the three most recent years, the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years. (Provided in GSIS)

3. Average Time to Degree – For each of the three most recent years, average of the graduates' time to degree. (Provided in GSIS)

4. 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. Available through GSIS in the future.
5. Admission Criteria – Description of admission factors.
6. Percentage of Full-Time Students – FTS/number of students enrolled (headcount) for the last three fall semesters. (Provided in GSIS)
7. 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. (Provided in GSIS)
8. Percentage of 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. (Provided in GSIS)
9. Number of Faculty – Number of faculty (defined as membership of the Graduate Studies Committee) in the prior year. (Provided in GSIS)
10. Student to 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 faculty. (Provided in GSIS)
11. Faculty Publications – For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers or publications, books or book chapters, juried creative or performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries, files, or patents issued per faculty member. Programs may use the Faculty Information System (FIS) https://utdirect.utexas.edu/apps/provost/faculty_profile/ as a starting point to collect this information. (If your faculty have not yet updated and certified their information, the program will have to supplement the information from FIS.)
12. Faculty External Grants – For each of the three most recent years, (1) average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, (2) average external funds per faculty, and (3) total external funds per program per academic year. (Provided in GSIS)
13. Faculty Teaching Load – Total number of semester credit hours in organized

teaching courses taught per academic year by faculty divided by the number of faculty. (Provided in GSIS)

14. Faculty Diversity – Faculty ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender. (Provided in GSIS)

15. Student Diversity – Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program during the prior year. (Provided in GSIS)

16. Date of Last External Review – Date of last formal external review.

17. External Program Accreditation – Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable.

18. Student Publications and Presentations – For the three most recent years, the number of discipline-related papers and publications, juried creative or performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE.

19. Student Enrollment – Defined as the number of students enrolled full-time in the doctoral program in the fall semester of the prior year in which the external review is conducted. (Provided in GSIS)

20. Graduate Licensure Rates – If applicable, information to be provided by the program.

21. Alignment of Program with Stated Program and Institutional Goals and Purposes – To be provided by the graduate program and should be based on mission statements published on the Graduate School and graduate program Web sites.

22. Program Curriculum and Duration in Comparison to Peer Programs – This information is provided by the graduate program and may be presented as an average or with a minimum of 3 example cases of peer program curriculums.

23. Program Facilities and Equipment - To be provided by the graduate program and, in most cases, will be available on the graduate program Web site.

24. Program Finance and Resources – Provide an operating budget for the academic year in which the external review is conducted. Include budgetary information for associated research centers, if any. Include a breakdown of the following expenses:

faculty and administrators, support staff, temporary or adjunct faculty and field staff, fringe, supplies and services (e.g., technology resources), travel, student financial aid (e.g., scholarships and student wages), other (e.g., continuing education workshops). Also include a breakdown of total doctoral student support, including fellowships and appointments. Programs may also include information about the tuition reduction benefit, student travel funds, as well as a description of a typical annual funding package. (Aggregate student support provided in GSIS.)

25. Program Administration – Identify the current graduate dean, college/school dean, department chair/program director, GSC chair, and graduate adviser. Also, include the following text from the Graduate Catalog: “The administration of the Graduate School is the responsibility of the dean of the Graduate School and senior vice provost for graduate and postdoctoral studies. Each academic area that offers a graduate degree has a Graduate Studies Committee, a group consisting of all assistant, associate, and full professors who are active in that graduate degree program. The Graduate Studies Committee recommends students for admission to the program, sets program-specific requirements for the graduate degrees in that area, and recommends students for admission to candidacy for degrees. Graduate education is the responsibility of the members of Graduate Studies Committees. One member serves as the graduate adviser to register and advise all graduate students, to maintain records, and to represent the Graduate School in matters pertaining to graduate work in that area.”

26. Faculty Qualifications – Provide a list of GSC faculty, including their highest degree obtained and the awarding institution. (Information provided in GSIS)

III. College/School Requirements - Each college/school dean may require additional information that is determined to be of particular interest to the college or school. Please consult with your dean to obtain information about these additional requirements, if any.

IV. Appendices

- Appendix A – current graduate student handbook.
- Appendix B – curriculum vita for all GSC faculty
- Appendix C – most recent Status Update Report (provided by the Graduate School)

NOTE: Confirm that the self-study report includes sufficient information to support the review team’s assessment of items they will be asked to address in the External Reviewer Report (See Appendix A).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT, MASTER'S PROGRAMS

A separate self-study report is required for each program review; however, when the Master's- and doctoral-level degrees are offered in the same discipline, a single report that includes information for both degrees can be used. The overall purpose of the report is to allow the graduate program to be portrayed as accurately and completely as possible. To that end, programs should include information to clarify these required elements. Minimum required elements of the Master's self-study report are listed below.

Master's graduate program reviews should include information related to state formula funded (Option I and II) programs and non-formula-funded (Option III) programs in a single self-study report. When an Option III program is offered as a stand-alone program without an Option I degree option, the Option III program will be reviewed alone.

A draft of the self-study report including a 1-4 page summary must be submitted to the college/school dean for review 45 days prior to the external review site visit. Following any revisions that may be recommended and 30 days prior to scheduled visit, the college/school dean or their designate submits the final version of the self-study report to the external review team and the Graduate School. Programs that have recently undergone an external review for accreditation purposes may submit the review report in addition to, but not in lieu of, the self-study required here. (See p. 21 for additional information regarding accreditation reviews)

I. Graduate School Requirements

(A) Narrative Description: Provide a description of the Master's degree program, including a description of self-supported (Option III) programs, when applicable. This description should clearly indicate when the degree is offered as a terminal degree option and when the degree is restricted for use by doctoral students on their way to or out of a doctoral degree within the discipline.

(B) Statement of Program Status: Provide a statement regarding the ranking of the graduate program with peer institutions. Include data from ranking sources that are most relevant to your program. If ranking data is unavailable, include your program's interpretation of ranking among peer institutions.

(C) Competition: Identify graduate programs that represent the greatest competition for top-quality students.

(D) Competitive Advantage: Identify points of effective program strength vs.

competitors.

(E) Competitive Disadvantage: Identify points over which the program loses top-quality students to competitors.

(F) Current Enhancement Efforts: Describe how the graduate program is currently pursuing improved ranking and competitiveness.

(G) Selectivity Index: For the past five years, provide the percentage of total applicants who were admitted. (Please Contact Shannon Neuse in GIAC for this data. shannon.neuse@austin.utexas.edu)

(H) Yield Index: For the past five years, provide the percentage of admitted students who enrolled. (Please Contact Shannon Neuse in GIAC for this data. shannon.neuse@austin.utexas.edu)

(I) Current admissions process: Describe your current admission cycle/s and holistic admissions process. Indicate how many faculty serve on the program's admissions committee and describe what role/s each member fulfills. Describe how test scores are used in the selection process. Describe how your program has or has not been effective recruiting students of different backgrounds, considering both applications and yield.

For the past three years, describe how many requests for conditional admission have been submitted and how many have been approved. Describe the basis of these requests; e.g., applicant lacking final transcript with bachelor's degree at the time of graduate admission. Describe differences in success rates for conditionally admitted students as reflected in relative graduation rates and time to degree.

(J) Teaching effectiveness of graduate faculty: Describe how the program assesses the teaching effectiveness of the graduate faculty. Describe any strategic plan for improving teaching effectiveness. Course & faculty assessment data can be gathered via the Course Instructor Surveys found at <https://utdirect.utexas.edu/ctl/ecis/results/index.WBX>. Instructions for analyzing results are found at <https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/analyze-cis>. In addition, note any faculty who are Provost's Teaching Fellows (<https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/meet-fellows>), any teaching awards, or other teaching honors, given to your graduate faculty.

(K) Graduate certificates: Describe any transcript-recognized graduate certificates offered, noting if the certificates are delivered on a formula-funded (Option I) or non-formula-funded (Option III) basis. Include application, enrollment, and completion data for the past five years. Indicate if the certificates are available to degree- or non-degree-seeking students. Describe the impact of the certificate programs on related degree programs and their students.

(L) Texas Extended Campus: Describe any graduate-level courses offered through Texas Extended Campus. Indicate if the courses are available to degree- or non-degree-seeking students. Describe if the courses are intended for use in satisfying background requirements or if they are being applied towards the Program of Work for the Master's degree. Describe the impact on degree-seeking students, faculty, and staff. Describe any impact the delivery of courses through Extended Campus has had on the program's budget or revenue.

(M) Program updates since last external review: Using the program's most recent Status Update Report provided by the Graduate School as a point of reference, describe actions that have been taken in response to external reviewer feedback to improve program quality.

(N) Program reviews of student progress: Describe the program's process for conducting annual reviews of student progress and communicating the results of these reviews to students.

(O) Referring to data provided in Item I, Current Admissions Process, describe the program's success in meeting the academic needs of students from different backgrounds. On request, the Graduate School will provide assistance assembling data on time to degree and graduation rates to supplement information or assessment provided in this section.

II. Coordinating Board Requirements: The data required for many elements of the self-study report will be made available through the Graduate Student Information System (GSIS) available at https://utdirect.utexas.edu/apps/gsi/grad_reporting/review/. The graduate program is responsible for inserting the data in the appropriate place in the self-study report.

(A) Number of Degrees Conferred Annually: For each of the three most recent years, the number of degrees awarded per academic year. (Provided in GSIS)

(B) Graduation Rates: For each of the three most recent years, the percentage of students completing the master's degree within 10 years of admission to a master's

program. (Provided in GSIS)

(C) Average Time to Degree: For each of the three most recent years, the average of the graduates' time to degree. (Provided in GSIS)

(D) Graduate Placement (i.e., employment or further education/ training): For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year employed, those still seeking employment, and unknown. This data will be available through GSIS in the future.

(E) Admission Criteria: Description of admission factors.

(F) Percentage of Full-Time Students: FTS/number of students enrolled (headcount) for the last three fall semesters. (Provided in GSIS)

(G) 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. (Provided in GSIS)

(H) Percentage of 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. (Provided in GSIS)

(I) Number of Core Faculty: Number of core faculty in the prior year. This number represents the membership of the Graduate Studies Committee for the prior year. (Provided in GSIS)

(J) Core Faculty/Student Ratio: For each of the three most recent years, the average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE)/the average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty. (Provided in GSIS)

(K) Faculty Publications: For each of the three most recent years, the average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers or publications, books or book chapters, juried creative or performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries, files, or patents issued per core faculty member.

(L) Faculty External Grants: For each of the three most recent years, (1) the average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, (2) the average external funds per faculty and, (3) the total external funds per program per academic year. (Provided in

GSIS)

(M) Faculty Teaching Load: The total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty. (Provided in GSIS)

(N) Faculty Diversity: Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender. (Provided in GSIS)

(O) Student Diversity: Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program during the prior year. (Provided in GSIS)

(P) Date of Last External Review: Date of last formal external review.

(Q) External Program Accreditation: Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable.

(R) Student Publications and Awards: For the three most recent years, the number of discipline-related papers and publications, juried creative or performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE.

(S) Student Enrollment: The number of students enrolled in the master's program in the fall semester of the prior year in which the external review is conducted. (Provided in GSIS)

(T) Graduate Licensure Rates: If applicable, information to be provided by the program.

(U) Alignment of Program with Stated Program and Institutional Goals and Purposes: This information is provided by the graduate program and should be based on mission statements published on the Graduate School and graduate program Web sites.

(V) Program Curriculum and Duration in Comparison to Peer Programs: This information is provided by the graduate program and may be presented as an average or with a minimum of 3 example cases of peer program curriculums.

(W) Program Facilities and Equipment: This information is provided by the graduate program and, in most cases, will be available on the graduate program Web site.

(X) Program Finance and Resources: Provide an operating budget for the academic year in which the external review is conducted. Include budgetary information for associated research centers, if any. Include a breakdown of the following expenses: faculty and administrators, support staff, temporary or adjunct faculty and field staff, fringe, supplies and services (e.g., technology resources), travel, student financial aid (e.g., scholarships and student wages), other (e.g., continuing education workshops). Also include a breakdown of total master's student support, including fellowships and appointments. Programs may also include information about the tuition reduction benefit, student travel funds, as well as a description of a typical annual funding package. (Student support provided in GSIS)

(Y) Program Administration: Identify the current graduate dean, college/school dean, department chair/program director, GSC chair, and graduate adviser. Also, provide the following text from the Graduate Catalog: The administration of the Graduate School is the responsibility of the dean of the Graduate School and senior vice provost for postdoctoral and graduate affairs. Each academic area that offers a graduate degree has a Graduate Studies Committee, a group consisting of all assistant, associate, and full professors who are active in that graduate degree program. The Graduate Studies Committee recommends students for admission to the program, sets program-specific requirements for the graduate degrees in that area, and recommends students for admission to candidacy for degrees. Graduate education is the responsibility of the members of Graduate Studies Committees. One member serves as the graduate adviser to register and advise all graduate students, to maintain records, and to represent the Graduate School in matters pertaining to graduate work in that area.

Z) Faculty Qualifications: Provide a list of GSC faculty, their highest degree obtained and the awarding institution. (Provided in GSIS)

III. College/School Requirements Each college/school dean may require additional information that is determined to be of particular interest to the college or school. Please consult with your college/school dean to obtain information about these additional requirements, if any.

IV. Graduate Assembly Requirements for Option II, Option III Programs: Following the Coordinating Board's implementation of a recurring review cycle for all graduate programs in the state of Texas, the graduate dean, with the support of the Graduate Assembly, consolidated the five-year review schedule previously established for Option II and III programs with the review schedule established by the Coordinating Board. Effective fall 2012, all Option II and III program reviews are conducted at the same time and in conjunction with

the associated option I program review. In order to satisfy the guidelines for reviewing Option III degree programs set forth by the Graduate Assembly, graduate programs offering an Option III degree program should also include the additional following information in the self-study report. Information contained in this section is limited to the non-formula-funded (Option III) program.

- (A) Faculty: Provide a roster of faculty who teach or participate in the non-formula-funded (Option III) program, including each faculty member's academic rank/title. Describe the annual percentage of T/TT faculty who teach in the Option III program as well as the annual percentage of T/TT faculty who teach in the Option I program.
- (B) Program Committees: Describe any faculty or staff committees that have been developed to support the operation and administration of the Option III program.
- (C) Admissions: Describe the application and admission process for the Option III program. For the past five years, provide the application yield index for Option III program applicants. Also provide the percentage of admitted students who enrolled. (Contact Shannon Neuse in GIAC for this program data: shannon.neuse@austin.utexas.edu)
- (D) Resources: Describe if/how the Option III program is funded and delivered without compromising the resources available for existing academic programs.
- (E) Student Evaluation: Describe how grading in the Option III program is carried out and how these procedures might differ from Option I grading procedures.
- (F) Graduation Rates: For each of the three most recent years, the percentage of students completing the Master's degree within 10 years of admission to a Master's program.
- (G) Student Time to Degree: For each of the three most recent years, the average of the graduates' time to degree. (Provided in GSIS)
- (H) Program Evaluation: Annual exit survey of students to include both instructor evaluations and evaluation of the Option III program

V. Appendices

- Appendix A – current graduate student handbook.
- Appendix B – curriculum vita for all GSC faculty

- Appendix C – Status Update Report

NOTE: Confirm that the self-study report includes sufficient information to support the review team’s assessment of items they will be asked to address in the External Reviewer Report (See Appendix A).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

A graduate program representative provides an itinerary and review-related instructions to members of the external review team prior to the site visit, including the following information:

Purpose of the Review: External reviews are conducted to satisfy reporting requirements of THECB and to support ongoing institutional assessment and improvement.

Self-Study Report: One month prior to the scheduled review, members of the review team will receive a self-study report reflecting data and information requirements established by UT Austin Graduate School, the college/school dean, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

Campus Interviews: During the site visit, the review team will conduct campus interviews with the groups listed below. (Note: The interviews listed below are required. Additional interviews may be conducted as it pertains to the nature and depth of the evaluation.)

- 1) **Welcome Meeting with dean of the Graduate School:** This is the first meeting of the site visit. In this brief (10 – 15 minute) meeting, Graduate Dean Sarah Ades welcomes the review team and outlines the University's objectives with respect to program improvement, reporting to the state, and implementation of recommendations. This meeting includes only the review team and the dean of the Graduate School. Graduate programs must contact the graduate dean's executive assistant, Veronica Davis (veronica.davis@austin.utexas.edu), to assess Dean Ades' availability prior to scheduling the Welcome Meeting and/or sending an electronic meeting invitation.
- 2) **Representative sample(s) of graduate students.** Graduate programs should avoid the practice of self-selecting individuals to participate in student interviews, instead scheduling interviews in a way that provides opportunities for input by a representative group of graduate students. The preferred approach, with consent of a course instructor, is to schedule time for the external review team to interview an entire class of students in the absence of the course instructor. The normal expectation is to have reviewers meet for 40 minutes with a required class of 20 or more students.

When a review includes degree options associated with distinct populations of students, the review team should have an opportunity to interview students

from each group. For example, graduate programs that offer a terminal Master's degree and a PhD degree should provide opportunities for interviews with both groups of students. Programs that offer formula-funded (Option I) and non-formula-funded (Option III) degree options should provide opportunities for interviews with both student populations. Variations to this student interview protocol are allowable with approval of the graduate dean.

Graduate programs must provide a description of scheduled student interviews to the graduate dean one month prior to a scheduled review.

- 3) **Department chair and/or program director, chair of the Graduate Studies Committee and graduate adviser.** (The review team should be advised about the appointment(s) and responsibilities associated with these roles per [HOP 9-1240, The Graduate School.](#))
- 4) **Other groups deemed necessary by the unit or college/school.**
- 5) **Final Exit Interview:** The Final Exit Interview is the final meeting of the program review, occurring after all other meetings have concluded on the final day of the site visit. This meeting includes the review team, the college/school dean, Graduate Dean Sarah Ades, and a member of the dean's senior staff. Graduate programs must assess both deans' availability for the Final Exit Interview prior to scheduling or sending electronic meeting invitations. Programs should contact Executive Assistant Veronica Davis (veronica.davis@austin.utexas.edu) to confirm the Graduate Dean's availability.

External Reviewer Report: Review teams should be instructed to develop and submit a report of their review to the college/school dean and graduate dean at graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu within 14 days of the external review, following the format provided in Appendix A of this packet. Generally, members of each review team will work together to determine their respective roles in preparing the report.

ACCREDITATION IN LIEU OF EXTERNAL REVIEW

Graduate programs that undergo external review for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation may be able to use their external accreditation review in lieu of the review process outlined in this document. To do so, accreditation and Coordinating Board review schedules must be aligned such that both are scheduled to take place in the same semester and year. The Graduate School can request an adjustment in the Coordinating Board's review schedule; however, we must ensure that all graduate programs are reviewed at least once during each defined review cycle. Please contact Senior Assistant Dean Michelle Broadway for assistance in rescheduling a program review.

Graduate programs that choose to use external accreditation reviews to satisfy their Coordinating Board review requirements should ensure that the self-study report submitted to the Graduate School includes all data points requested in these instructions in addition to those required by the accrediting body. Program information that is required by the Graduate School which is not also required for the accreditation review may be prepared as a separate document and submitted as a supplement to the self-study report.

Additionally, the graduate dean asks that final interview of the accreditation site visit include the review team, the college/school dean and the graduate dean. Representatives of the graduate program do not attend this meeting.

Deliverables to the Graduate School:

- Self-study report
- 1-4 page executive summary
- Reviewer report
- Full CV for each reviewer
- Institutional response

TIMELINE AND CHECKLIST FOR CONDUCTING GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

- Seven Months Prior to Semester of Review
 - Graduate School sends email reminder
 - Approximately March 1 for fall reviews
 - Approximately Sept 1 for spring reviews

- Six Months Prior to External Review Site Visit
 - Program submits ranked list of 10 potential reviewers to Graduate School¹
 - Fall reviews by May 1
 - Spring reviews by Nov 1
 - Graduate School sends invitations to potential external reviewers
 - Program submits proposed dates of site visit to Graduate School ²
 - Program schedules 15-minute Welcome Meeting with external reviewers and graduate dean by emailing Veronica Davis, veronica.davis@austin.utexas.edu.
 - Program schedules the final meeting of the site visit, the Final Exit Interview. This meeting includes the review team, the college/school dean, Graduate Dean Sarah Ades, and member of the graduate dean's senior staff. Graduate programs must assess the availability of both deans prior to scheduling the Final Exit Interview or sending electronic meeting invitations. Programs may contact the graduate dean's executive assistant, Veronica Davis (veronica.davis@austin.utexas.edu) to assess Dean Ades' availability.

- Forty-five Days Prior to External Review Site Visit
 - Program submits draft of self-study report, including 1-4 page executive summary, to college/school dean
 - Updated GSIS reports available October 15

- One Month Prior to External Review Site Visit
 - Program submits final draft of self-study report to college/school dean and UT Box
 - Program submits 1-4 page executive summary to college/school dean and UT Box
 - Program submits description of student interview process to UT Box
 - College/school dean (or their designate) sends the self-study report, including executive summary, to external reviewers

¹ Vet with College/School Dean's Office prior to submitting to [UT Box](#)

² Submitted to both graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu and the College/School Dean

- Site Visit Conducted as Scheduled
 - Fall reviews prior to December 1
 - Spring reviews prior to April 30

- Fourteen Days After External Review Site Visit
 - External review team submits report to college/school dean and graduate dean

- Days 15-30 After External Review Site Visit
 - Response of department chair or program director submitted to college/school dean

- Days 15-90 After External Review Site Visit
 - College/school dean develops and submits first draft of Institutional Response to UT Box
 - Graduate dean and college/school dean meet to discuss details of Institutional Response
 - College/school dean submits revised draft of Institutional Response to UT Box
 - OGS sends formal thank you email

- Days 90-120 After External Review Site Visit
 - Institutional Response forwarded to Provost for approval
 - Program or college/school dean provides total cost information to Graduate School for reporting to Provost (institutional costs)

- 120 Days After Site Visit
 - Graduate School uploads self-study executive summary, the external reviewer report, and the Institutional Response to UT System & THECB. A copy is sent to the program director/department chair.

- One year, three years, five years and seven years following program review
 - Program submits Status Update Report to college/school dean and graduate dean (graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu).

- Two+ years after review
 - THECB sends UT Austin a response. The response, typically a summary of the review, is forwarded to the graduate dean, school/college dean and department chair/program director.

Appendix A: Graduate Program Reviewer Report

Area of Study/Major: _____

Degree(s) Reviewed: _____

(See [Graduate Catalog](#) for [list of graduate degrees offered by Area of Study](#))

The external review committee (ERC) is composed of three distinguished scholars: (First name Last name) of (XXX University); (First name Last name) of (XXX University); and (First name Last name) of (XXX University). The ERC visited the UT Austin campus on (Month Days), (Year).

General comments of the ERC:

ERC Response:

Required Questions, UT Austin Graduate School:

1. Overall impression of the program

ERC Response:

2. Quality of faculty and graduate students

ERC Response:

3. Appropriateness of level of depth and breadth of the program curriculum

ERC Response:

4. Satisfaction and esprit de corps of faculty and graduate students

ERC Response:

5. Accuracy and comprehensiveness of the Self-Study

ERC Response:

6. What, if any, other information should have been provided?

ERC Response:

7. Ranking among peer institutions

ERC Response:

8. Competition: Programs that represent greatest competition for top-quality students

ERC Response:

9. Major strengths of the program relative to the competition

ERC Response:

10. Major weakness of the program relative to the competition

ERC Response:

11. Adequacy/competitiveness of student financial support (please tell us how our financial support compares with yours)

ERC Response:

12. Effectiveness of student placement after graduation

ERC Response:

13. Recommended actions to improve quality, competitiveness and ranking

ERC Response:

14. Additional questions from the graduate program or academic college/school, if any.

ERC Response:

15. Summary of recommendations, or action items, referenced in Items 1-16.

ERC Response:

Please submit this reviewer report to *(insert name of graduate program representative)* and to graduatedean@austin.utexas.edu within 14 days of the site visit.

Appendix B: Institutional Response Guidelines and Sample

Graduate Program Reviews Developing the Institutional Response to Reviewers' Report

Following receipt of the External Review Committee (ERC) report, the Department Chair (or Program Director) should develop a written response to each criticism and recommendation of the ERC and submit the response to the Graduate Dean and Academic Dean within 30 days of the site visit.

The Graduate Dean and Academic Dean will meet to discuss the response of the Department Chair/Program Director. The Academic Dean will then prepare a first draft of the **Institutional Response (IR)**. The Graduate Dean and Academic Dean meet to finalize details of the IR within 90 days of the site visit.

Following development of IR, the following materials are submitted to the provost for review: full self-study report, summary of the self-study report, ERC report, ERC CV's, institutional response.

Following approval by the provost, the following materials are submitted to UT System and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board: summary of the self-study report, ERC report, and the IR signed by the provost.

~~~~~  
The Institutional Response (IR) should address each recommendation and suggestion for improvement included in the ERC report and should be drafted to reflect the tone and voice of Provost Wood.

The following guidelines are intended to guide an academic dean's development of this document:

- Provide a thoughtful response to each criticism and recommendation of the ERC. Remember that you are drafting a response in the tone and voice of Provost Wood.
- For all criticisms that require action to resolve, describe the action plan that will be implemented. Ensure that this is done in consultation with the department, school or college as needed.
- In your action plan, make it clear who will own the responsibility for addressing each concern (e.g., the faculty (GSC), the administration (department or college), the Graduate School, the Provost)
- In the Institutional Response, the term 'we' represents the institution-level 'we,' rather than the department- or program-level 'we'. The program undergoing review should be referenced throughout the IR as "the graduate program in (*discipline/major*)."
- Use the full names of graduate programs and associated administrative units; e.g., "The graduate program in Creative Writing is housed within the Department of English in the College of Liberal Arts."
- Attribute perspectives to the appropriate graduate program, department, or faculty. For example, "The graduate program in Creative Writing appreciates this recommendation," or, "The Department of English agrees that this is the program's biggest challenge. The Graduate Studies Committee is aware of this concern, and they plan to explore options at a summer retreat."
- Avoid any tone of defensiveness. For example:

The review team noted, "*Students report that they need more direct feedback from their supervisors.*"

Defensive Response: We already do this.

Better Response: The graduate program recently implemented annual assessments of student progress that will generate written feedback to students, but we recognize there may be more to do in addressing these concerns. The graduate program will monitor the impact of the new annual review process and continue to explore opportunities for enhancing the frequency and/or clarity of advising feedback.

- The Graduate Dean and Provost's Office will help develop responses to institution-level concerns, including the following:
  - Parental leave
  - Sabbatical leave
  - DEI
  - Fringe rate
  - Stipends/financial competitiveness

An example of an Institutional Response is attached.

## External Review of the Graduate Program in Imaginary Science

NAME OF COLLEGE

MONTH | YEAR

**Commented [GS1]:** This reflects the month the response is submitted to the Provost for review (not the month of the site visit)

**Background.** The graduate program in Imaginary Science is designed to teach graduate students how to (fill in the blank). The Department of Imagination aims to provide the highest quality instruction and training for their graduate students, to produce PhDs who are qualified to compete for the best jobs in academia as well as jobs in the private sector.

Several features of UT Austin's graduate program in Imaginary Science set it apart from other similar programs. Provide a brief description of unique program features. Potentially include a statement about program ranking.

**Program Review.** The Graduate School and College of Imagination hosted an external review committee (ERC) composed of three distinguished scholars: Professor First name Last name (XXX University); First name Last name (XXX University); First name Last name (XXX University). The ERC visited the campus on Month Day, Year, and produced a report that highlights the strengths of the graduate program and some challenges.

The ERC provided several recommendations to improve the graduate program's competitiveness and ranking. These are listed below, along with actions identified to address each recommendation.

**Commented [BML2]:** Provide responses to all recommendations and suggestions for improvement included in the reviewers' report.

Responses to positive feedback are not required.

1. *The ERC recommended that the graduate program seek to increase the size and diversity of each year's cohort.*

Response: The College of Imagination's dean's office is currently reviewing the Department of Imaginary Science's budget and development efforts to identify opportunities to increase the number and size of funding packages (including summer support) for admitted students. The department has already increased its hourly stipend rates in line with the recommendations of the UT Graduate Education Task Force. Given that expanding the size of the admitted cohort while also expanding the funding packages is dependent on budgetary resources, the department will first seek to attract more diverse and high-quality cohorts with higher funding packages before attempting to grow the size of the program.

2. *The ERC recommended the inclusion of more faculty input, particularly from junior faculty members, during the student recruitment process. The reviewers wrote, "The admissions process should be adjusted to allow for more input from the faculty, especially junior faculty hoping to identify students who would be good fits for their labs."*

Response: The graduate program in Imaginary Science will explore ways in which it can better include input from a wider array of faculty. One mechanism to improve the visibility of junior faculty among recruits would be to arrange a special meeting or informal social time between recruits and only junior faculty.

- 3. The ERC noted the importance of maintaining and improving effective communication between graduate students, the graduate advisor and graduate coordinator, writing, "Communication with the students need to be improved. A first step might be to hold town hall meetings where students and postdoctoral fellows can share their experiences and identify opportunities for improvement."*

Response: The graduate program in Imaginary Science agrees. The faculty have started scheduling regular Progression Committee meetings for students who have not yet formed their dissertation committees. Progression Committee meetings are small-group meetings chaired by the graduate advisor that convene at least twice per year. This practice ensures that expectations are well conveyed to the students, academic problems can be quickly identified, and that individual student concerns are promptly identified and addressed. The graduate program in Imaginary Science hopes that this change will improve communication.

In further efforts to improve communication, the Director of the graduate program in Imaginary Science now meets monthly with student representatives of the program's Executive Committee to discuss student needs and concerns. This practice provides an important conduit for student issues to be communicated directly and promptly to program leadership.

- 4. The ERC noted, "Work needs to be done on improving interaction between students in the Master's and PhD programs."*

Response: The graduate program in Imaginary Science appreciates this comment and will look for opportunities to enhance interaction. Currently, PhD students may take Master's-level courses. The program intends to further explore ways in which PhD seminars may be opened to highly qualified Master's students, particularly in courses where additional students would add to the quality of the in-class experience. In addition, the program will examine ways in which professional development and career services can expand programming to be more inclusive of PhD students and their particular needs and interests in these areas.

- 5. The ERC recommended that the graduate program examine its staffing levels to determine if these are adequate. They mentioned that the current administrator could use additional help. They wrote, "This could help avoid some of the communication problems noted by the students...High priority should be given to establishing a database for tracking outcomes of past, current, and future students and postdocs."*

Response: The program will look critically at its staffing levels to determine if these are adequate. Regarding the second point, the School of Imagination will ensure that the graduate program is aware of longitudinal career tracking done by the college.

6. *The ERC suggested strengthening faculty commitment to the PhD program via more active roles in mentoring and advising.*

Response: The graduate program in Imaginary Science completely agrees. Building faculty commitment to the PhD program is a major priority for the School of Imagination and The University of Texas at Austin. The Imaginary Science GSC is currently being revitalized, with both the influx of early-career and more research-active faculty. The graduate program is currently being restructured to ensure that two faculty mentors are assigned to each student in the first year, with robust guidelines on the responsibilities of those mentors. The School of Imagination also intends to pull more faculty into the newly redesigned curriculum through co-creation of syllabi, guest appearances in classes, and participation in the PhD Colloquium (its professionalization seminar). While we hope faculty will be intrinsically motivated to actively participate in the PhD Program, the School of Imagination's dean's office is considering a range of incentives to provide external motivation – including service credit, teaching, and advising awards, and small monetary stipends for service to the PhD program “above and beyond” normal expectations. As a sidenote, in Fall 2021 the School of Imagination began to work actively with the UT Graduate Career and Professional Development team to improve mentoring, career services, and alumni data tracking. The focus has been to enhance advising and mentoring for students seeking non-academic (or hybrid) careers.

7. *The ERC noted that the graduate program did not appear to have developed a strategic plan in recent years, and they recommended, “A strategic plan should be developed, taking into account the changing times, shifting in career priorities from academic to non-academic, and the demographic shift to a new generation of faculty and students who are more aware of, and committed to, issues of social justice, gender bias, discrimination and harassment.”*

Response: This point of feedback is well-taken; the development of strategic plans is a key priority for the graduate program in Imaginary Science. Program faculty will begin developing such a plan in consultation with the program graduate advisor, members of the Graduate Studies Committee, and graduate students.

8. *The ERC recommended that annual reviews of faculty and students be conducted to ensure adequate progress is being made with the immediate steps taken to address ongoing problems and incorporate any ongoing issues or new issues that arise into the longer-term plan for improving the graduate program.*

Response: The graduate program in Imaginary Science recently implemented annual reviews that include a report signed by each student's committee and the graduate

advisor. These reports will continue to be monitored by the graduate advisor. In addition, the Department of Imaginary Science commits to developing a process for open communication to improve the mentored experience for the student while still meeting expectations of the program.

9. *The ERC noted, "Work with the development/foundation office on fundraising for endowment funds to increase discretionary resources in the department."*

Response: The Chair of the Department of Imaginary Science will work with School of Imagination development officers to define priority areas for future fundraising.

10. *The ERC recommended that the admissions review process include an enhanced role of potential faculty mentors and advisors to ensure that incoming students will be well-matched with faculty and aligned with core strengths in the teaching and research activities of the school. They also suggested that the graduate program eliminate the prerequisite of an MA degree for admission to the PhD program and take steps to proactively market the PhD program in appropriate venues.*

Response: We fully agree with the ERC's recommendation. The School of Imagination is already taking steps to amend the admissions review process to include the direct participation of potential faculty mentors and advisors. In terms of changing the MA requirement, this is an item that is currently under discussion by the PhD Internal Review Committee and will be debated further by the Imaginary Science GSC in Spring 2022. The School of Imagination will also actively advertise at conferences, professional associations, and venues such as Imaginary Venue.

11. *The ERC stated, "The biggest challenge preventing further improvement in the graduate program is the current number of tenure track faculty. The number of tenured faculty is simply too small for the department to be able to fulfill its education and research mission at the expected level of excellence. Along these lines, the college dean should commit to a hiring plan. This plan should be created in tight consultation with the department. It should chart the maximum number of hires authorized for multiple years to come and should take advantage of the unique opportunity presented with many other schools having hiring freezes." The ERC further noted that the shrinking of the faculty and loss of several highly recognized faculty reflects negatively on the program's reputation and, also, that the department's inability to compensate for these losses through senior hiring is affecting the morale of the faculty.*

Response: The Department of Imagination will work with school leadership to develop a strategic hiring plan that includes a quantitative goal of faculty size over a five-year horizon. This approach will enable growth in targeted areas based on that strategic plan. The School of Imagination is already working with the department to grow its faculty; for example, this year the department has been authorized to search for two tenure-track positions, two tenured positions, and one position that is open to either tenure-track or

tenured candidates. In addition, if the recruitment initiated in the summer of 2020 of a candidate for an associate professor position is not successful, the department can search for another tenured candidate. Such a strong commitment to recruiting illustrates that expanding the size of Imaginary Science faculty is a joint priority of the department and the school. The department will also work with school leadership to update its detailed space plan if needed. Internally, the chair of Department of Imagination will appoint an ad-hoc faculty hiring committee composed of department faculty members charged with making recommendations suggestions for strategic changes related o faculty hiring and retention. In alignment with this committee's suggestions, the department will continue broad canvassing for mid- level and senior-level hiring opportunities. In this regard, it acknowledges the importance of identifying and targeting more candidates from historically marginalized groups, and this will be a key emphasis of future searches.

**Summary.** We thank the reviewers for their careful and thoughtful evaluation and are grateful to the faculty and staff in the College of Imagination for their investment in preparing the comprehensive internal report and collaboration with the visiting reviewers. We are glad to observe the overall recognition of the excellence within the Imaginary Science graduate program and will continue to work with the faculty, staff and students to meet the challenges that we are facing as an institution and maintain the high level of excellence in the program.

---

**Sharon Wood**  
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST