



DOCTORAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The PhD program review formalizes the process of routinely analyzing programs at the University of Rochester and occurs at regular intervals. The purpose of the review is to assess the current state, future trajectory, and successes and challenges facing academic programs whose quality and reputation are vital to the University’s mission of Meliora.

The doctoral program review assesses the educational quality of degree programs, engagement of faculty in the program, the success of the admissions process, satisfaction and success of graduates, capacity for improvement (goals vs resources), and the vision and leadership reflected in strategic planning.

To ensure that all PhD programs are evaluated in a manner that is standardized across the University, this program review document is completed by each program/department offering a PhD degree. Standardized assessment will allow for consistency and comparability of the data across programs, reveal best practices and current innovative approaches, as well as identify areas of improvement or potential suggestions for further growth and success. Please complete the sections in the indicated format.

To assist programs in completing their review, the University Offices of Graduate Education and Postdoctoral Affairs, Academic Assessment and Institutional Research will each provide workshops, information management systems, and institutional data repositories for programs to access and utilize.

I: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

1. Name of the program and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) and Chair if appropriate
2. URL for the program
3. Mission/vision for the program and how it is connected to the University mission
4. Recent national/international rankings if available
5. Name of program accreditor (if appropriate)
6. Factors that determine the size of the program
7. Factors that distinguish program from top 5 peer institutions (**use peer institutions from Table 1A**)
8. *Suggested Appendices*: current strategic plan for the program/school, indicators of program strengths (publications/academic analytics/etc), specialized accreditor self-study (if applicable), program history, etc.

Table 1A. Top 5 Peer Institutions: Program Comparison

Data provided by programs

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

II: STUDENTS

1. Number of students currently enrolled in the program.
2. Criteria used in admitting students.
3. Explanation/data as to why students choose to attend UR compared to top 5 peer institutions, or why students are being lost to top 5 peer institutions (**use peer institutions from tables II- B, C**).
4. Description of how students are supported financially in the program. Included information about all forms of financial support as well as length and source of support.
5. How does the length of support compare to the average time to degree of students in the program?
6. Frequency that students are formally reviewed or evaluated. Describe the process. If individual development plans are required: who is responsible for working on these, how is compliance with the requirement verified, how often is the plan updated, how is the plan documented, how are students involved in the process.
7. Frequency that students are trained for responsible and ethical conduct of research (if applicable). Who is responsible for maintaining and verifying records?
8. Information on how/if students are supported by external funding sources, # of applications, success rates, incentives, etc.
9. Information on how the program exposes students to academic and non-academic career paths.
10. Information on how the program assists students in the job search process
11. Describe how student experience and satisfaction are assessed within the program and provide details if available.
12. Summarize findings from 1-11 and include areas for improvement and innovation.
13. *Required appendix: Program Handbook for students. Suggested appendices: Admissions rubrics or tools, sample offer letter for admission and support, sample individual development plan and documentation of compliance, documentation of compliance in completing ethic conduct of research training (if applicable), survey data (ex. satisfaction, graduating student, alumni).*

III: FACULTY

IV: CURRICULUM

V. DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION

VI. ASSESSMENT PLAN

VII. SUMMARY

REVIEW TEAM REPORT