

GPEC Program Review of Graduate Programs Seattle Pacific University

GPEC is charged with the responsibility for reviewing the design and implementation of graduate programs, specifically including regular cycles of review.

Process

Each program under review should produce a document of not more than 10 pages that incorporates the following material. While one person, perhaps the Director of Graduate Programs, may be responsible for writing an initial draft, GPEC encourages faculty to spend some time as a community to discuss the findings, implications, and future directions prompted by this draft before putting together a final document.

During the assigned quarter, GPEC will request the Director of each program under review to provide a written report describing the program. GPEC needs to receive this report at least two weeks prior to meeting to review the program. Following receipt of the report, the Director will be invited to a GPEC meeting to review the report and answer questions from GPEC members. While conducting its own review, GPEC will ask the appropriate Dean to respond to the program's written report. Upon completion of the review, GPEC will prepare a final written assessment and response to the report. Final reports are presented to Faculty Council with a recommendation that a brief report be given at Faculty Senate. The final report will include commendations, suggestions, and recommendations.

Program Report Outline

Since professional schools generally have secondary accreditation reviews, Directors may use the format and content of reports used for recent accreditation purposes. However, programs under review should include the following information:

- 1. Program Mission Statement**
 - a. catalogue copy
 - b. self-assessment process

- 2. Quantitative Data (five-year trend)**
 - a. Student enrollments
 - b. Graduates
 - c. Faculty FTE

- 3. Curriculum**
 - a. summary
 - b. critique (e.g., extent to which the program is developmental, number of courses on the books that have not been offered in the past two years, difficulties in the delivery of the program, degree to which courses help achieve the departmental goals and mission
 - c. recent changes and projected changes

4. Faculty

- a. description and needs
- b. evaluation of areas of expertise in relationship to the curriculum
- c. evaluation of the overall scholarship of the faculty and its relationship to the curriculum
- d. evaluation of advising and teaching with the program as a whole

5. Outcomes assessment

- a. characteristics of a successfully-educated graduate of this program
- b. opportunities for employment or further education of the successful graduate
- c. initial thoughts on how to implement outcomes assessment of the program in a useful and valid way
- d. ideas concerning outside evaluators (other than accrediting bodies)