

FINAL REPORT

March 21, 2008

University of North Texas review of graduate education and linkages to research

February 25-26, 2008

Review team:

Karen L. Klomparens, Associate Provost and Dean, Graduate School, Michigan State University (Plant Biology)

Jeffery Gibeling, Dean, Graduate Studies, University of California, Davis (Materials Science and Engineering)

Linda Lacey, Dean, Graduate School, University of New Mexico (City and Regional Planning)

Introduction

The review team was provided with graduate program data (admission criteria, student enrollment and degrees, part-time/full-time, diversity, and support; faculty research, diversity, and SCHs), the graduate catalog, and other summary/marketing documents related to research and graduate programs at UNT. The team met with approximately 50 individuals and groups over two days (Appendix A). The review team also posed a set of questions for each group as “discussion starters” (Appendix B).

We were impressed with the commitment of the senior administrators, faculty, and support staff to the University of North Texas and its promise to become an emerging research university. The faculty indicated their cautious, but optimistic, enthusiasm for the “emerging research university” concept and applauded the administration for its current planning. “This is an exciting time and we are waiting to see if the administrative decisions will meet the goal and be sustainable.”

We were also impressed with the enthusiasm of the graduate students. The graduate students recognized and appreciated the support of the faculty, as well as the interest of the faculty in their individual successes. Graduate students told us that they felt the “student centered” focus of UNT. Graduate students also expressed an appreciation for Dean Terrell and Associate Dean Schneider. Both were recognized for their unfailing support of graduate education and for their assistance to individual graduate student success. In addition, the library was singled out as a very helpful and visible organization in support of graduate education and graduate students.

This report is organized around the 5 specific questions posed by Provost Wendy Wilkins. Each set of Recommendations is preceded by a short section on What We Learned. We hope that our observations and recommendations will assist the University of North Texas in reaching its goal of becoming a research university. The potential was clearly apparent to us.

We thank all of the participants in our discussion sessions. A special thank you to the Provost and her staff for making our visit pleasant and efficient. We wish the University of North Texas the best of success!

Observations and recommendations

I. What processes might we undertake to determine the real strengths and weaknesses of our current graduate programs? What process can be used to determine the most appropriate graduate education areas to receive significant investment?

What We Learned

UNT does not presently have an effective process for graduate program review. The former departmental review process, which included both undergraduate and graduate programs, was viewed as ineffective by the faculty and administrators with whom we spoke. The primary reason for this view is the lack of accountability built into the process; recommendations were sent to departments, but no one in the administration ever checked that any changes resulted from these recommendations. As a consequence, faculty realized that the process was not meaningful and gave it less of their (precious) time and attention. We were also concerned that neither the Graduate Council nor the Graduate School played any significant role in the review process. As a consequence, Graduate Council had responsibility for approving degree requirements but no mechanisms for monitoring the quality of programs. Although external assessments of graduate quality are important (e.g. the National Research Council assessment of research doctorates, accreditation reviews and rankings by professional associations), the Committee believes that an effective University program review process is critical to ensuring the quality of graduate education.

Useful program assessment requires an agreed upon set of metrics, at least some of which must be valid across disciplines and some of which may be relevant within specific disciplines. The faculty and administrators with whom we spoke had relatively consistent views on the list of metrics that should be considered and these agree with our own assessment of the factors that are important in evaluating program quality:

External indicators including peer rankings of UNT programs, research funding awarded to UNT faculty, number of external fellowships received by UNT students and ability to compete in recruiting students.

Internal indicators including completion rates, time-to-degree, selectivity of admissions, placement (based on types of careers the program prepares students for and the kind the students the program wants and gets), numbers of masters, doctoral and professional students, balance of full-time vs. part-time students, number and

diversity balance in programs (gender, under-represented minorities, domestic/international).

In addition, broader institutional indicators should factor into the evaluations, including balance of master's and doctoral students, numbers of postdocs in each program (relates to the research mission), sources of and extent of support for graduate students (fellowships, assistantships), faculty research productivity (publications, citations, awards, grants), match and fit of graduate program to the mission and priorities of UNT (and the state coordinating board). Helpful guidance can be found in "Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: A Policy Statement", published by the Council of Graduate Schools, 2005. Two copies were provided to Provost Wilkins.

A key point is that each program needs to know what it wishes to be, what types of students it wishes to serve and with which institutions it wishes to compete. These ideas go beyond just saying "We want to be in the top X." Reflection on these goals should be a part of strategic planning and program review.

It would be challenging to develop an evaluation process that uses all of the above indicators in a meaningful way. However, two reference points can guide decisions on which data to gather: the doctoral program metrics identified in the NRC study and by the Texas State Coordinating Board. These would need to be expanded or modified to apply to master's programs as well.

The Review Team could not identify any planning process that is currently used to make decisions regarding which graduate programs should grow, should receive investments or should be scaled back. Similarly, there is no mechanism to identify areas for new program development. To some extent, the research cluster proposal process will help inform graduate program development. However, a more systematic process is needed to make strategic decisions that relate to other planning efforts.

We reviewed the UNT Academic Plan (<http://meta.lis.unt.edu/starchive/handle/2189/156>) prepared in 2005 by a faculty committee. Although the recommended implementation steps for the Plan do not appear to be currently active, we found the themes, strategic initiatives, and specific activities to be an excellent starting point for further progress. We do recommend, however, that the strategic area on graduate education (#2) and the strategic area (#3) on research and scholarship be more closely aligned.

Recommendations

- 1) Identify a set of metrics to use in graduate program evaluations. These must include common metrics across all programs as well as individual program metrics that serve as internal goals for program improvement and achievement. These metrics should be identified through faculty consultation via the Graduate Council and should be widely publicized across the campus.

- 2) Develop an effective graduate program review process. This process should include both quantitative and qualitative measures of program effectiveness and quality. The Graduate Council should play a central role in conducting the reviews, in partnership with the Graduate School. Feedback should be provided to each program with an expectation that the program will report back on its progress in addressing issues and concerns in a timely manner. As with the former departmental review process, at least one external reviewer should be invited to the campus for each program, both to provide external perspectives and to help develop the reputation of UNT with faculty at other institutions. Reviews should be conducted every 7-8 years (no more than every 10 years) with no more than 1 year for program response.
- 3) Develop a graduate program planning process that parallels the current research cluster initiative. Proposals for university investment in existing programs and development of new programs (with appropriate investment) should be developed by faculty groups and should be vetted by the deans prior to submission to the Provost.
- 4) Provost Wilkins should consider constituting the Academic Planning Council (or using a sub committee of Graduate Council, augmented with others) and the Implementation Committee, Infrastructure and Support Committee (in concert with the Vice President for Research), and the Resource and Accountability Committee (in concert with the Vice President for Research) as recommended in the Academic Plan. We see no need to “reinvent the wheel”, since the Plan sets out values and strategies to help with recommendations in our report.

II. What graduate programs at UNT that are sufficiently well-developed and/or distinctive can truly be considered areas of national-level of excellence?

What We Learned

UNT already identified some programs that it believes are distinctive as evidenced in the catalog and other promotional materials. In a period of two days, it was not possible for the Review Team to independently assess the quality of programs. However, from our many conversations, there was a reasonable consistency in the list of programs cited as excellent or having the potential for excellence:

Biology (especially environmental), Chemistry, Political Science, Philosophy (especially environmental ethics), Public Administration, Psychology, Geography, Music (especially the DMA and Musicology), School of Library and Information Science, Visual Arts and Design, Merchandising and Hospitality Management, Counseling (Education), Educational Computing, Curriculum and Instruction, Computer Science and Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering. The identification of these programs as strong was generally based on internal reputation, perceptions of external reputation and current levels of federal research funding. Clearly the program review process and metrics

identified earlier should be used to provide quantitative and qualitative assessments of program quality and strength.

We noted that there are a large number of degrees, programs and concentrations for the number of students and faculty. For example, in some disciplines both the MA and MS are offered (although one or the other may be taken by the majority of students). Each concentration is tracked separately by the Graduate School and contributes to the claim of having 161 graduate programs. Often students do not know the details of what they wish to study when they enter graduate school. Further, program quality is often linked to program size through the impact that a large program can have. We believe it would be helpful to students and overall workload to simply use broad majors and leave the issues of concentrations to the programs to monitor. For example, we understand that the 7 “flavors” of Chemistry are to be collapsed into a single major.

Recommendations

- 1) In the short term, a subset of the metrics identified above should be used to provide a quantitative assessment of program strength. The metrics for doctoral programs identified by the Texas State Coordinating Board serve as a practical starting point and could be adopted for master’s and professional degree programs. However, these metrics must be supplemented by an assessment of the value of each program to the overall mission and priorities of UNT.
- 2) In the long term, the graduate program review process should be used to assess program quality on a continuing basis (also in Academic Plan). The outcomes of program review must be taken seriously, leading to recommendations to improve programs, maintain strong ones and close those that are unable to achieve their stated goals.
- 3) Simplify the number of degrees, programs and concentrations to streamline record keeping and clarify student choices.
- 4) Consider professional science master’s (PSM) degree programs as well as doctoral programs that will support the research mission. These PSM degrees developed across the U.S. in the past decade and continue to be supported by foundations such as Sloan. <http://www.cgsnet.org/Default.aspx?tabid=120>

III. What should be the role of the graduate school/college in the professional development of graduate students? Relatedly, what types of programs should be offered under the auspices of our graduate school (i.e., centrally) rather than within individual units and/or programs?

IV. What levels and types of staffing does our graduate school require to support our “emerging research” university? More specifically, are there any new programs recommended as part of the preceding question?

What We learned

Each group of individuals we met provided fairly consistent comments on the current roles and functions of the Graduate School:

- 1) Quality control: a) sets standards and policies for programs in terms of admissions, residency, and graduation requirements, b) responsible for graduate faculty reviews, c) reviews curriculum of graduate programs/courses and d) monitors the publishing of theses and dissertations.
- 2) Funding: obtains and allocates financial resources for students.
- 3) Professional development activities: a) 2-day orientation each semester for teaching assistants and teaching fellows, and b) conference presentation travel awards.
- 4) Building the quality of the applicant pool: recruitment activities including efforts to build a diverse student body.
- 5) Coordination and dissemination of information related to graduate programs.

The Graduate School staff consists of two Ph.D. level individuals, the Dean and the Associate Dean. The remaining 27 people identified on the organizational chart (not equal to FTEs) serve in a support capacity for the many monitoring functions in the Graduate School. Many Graduate School staff members have multiple roles and tasks and are seen by students as being very dedicated to students and graduate education. It was apparent to us that the Graduate School was reasonably well-staffed for a monitoring function, but perhaps not for a leadership/facilitation function for an “emerging research university”.

The Graduate School website appeared to focus mostly on recruitment of new students. It was not obvious where continuing students would find information. For example, none of the Review Team members were able to identify the names of the Graduate School staff from the web site. Furthermore, there should be ample reference to graduate student research if UNT wishes to be considered a research university.

The Graduate School of UNT is engaged in limited professional development activities. They offer a two day orientation for teaching assistants and teaching fellows, and give conference presentation travel awards to students.

The Office of the Vice President for Research has taken a major step by strongly recommending that research grants include funding for graduate research assistantships. This effort should over time increase financial support of graduate students while providing students with an active learning experience on research projects of faculty.

The recommendations that follow are intended to improve the effectiveness of the Graduate School in support of the “emerging research university” goal by evolving the current monitoring function to that of facilitator and leadership roles. With that evolution, the faculty, chairs, and deans must be willing to take on the responsibilities of monitoring quality and adherence to University policies. As UNT develops more of a research culture, the programs will more routinely monitor policies at their level as this will ensure quality.

Recommendations (some directly from interview participants and the Academic Plan)

- 1) The Graduate School, with input from Graduate Council and Associate Deans and/or graduate program advisors, should conduct a review of all policies in the Graduate Catalog especially to determine whether centralized or decentralized processes will be the most effective. What is really necessary at the Graduate School level? E.g., approval of graduate faculty: “there are ways around this”. A lot of time is spent considering the levels and which faculty can participate. Can department chairs or deans do this more effectively and efficiently?
- 2) To promote and enhance UNT efforts in maintaining and increasing its status as a research institution, the Graduate School will need to assess its relationships and collaborations with the Office of the Vice President for Research, academic deans and faculty. The Graduate School will also need to develop programs that promote the research of graduate students.
- 3) To promote the efforts of the Vice President for Research, a Cluster Research Assistantship program could be developed where a small number of graduate students are funded by the Provost Office to assist in the development of the research clusters. A small program of this nature could demonstrate the critical role that graduate students play in the creation of knowledge.
- 4) Streamline the admissions process—the current process of separate documents/copies to the Graduate School and the units adds unnecessary complexity. Compounding that with a review in International Studies and Programs slows down the process, leads to redundancy and useless work done on applications that are not seen as competitive by the faculty. One suggestion is to wait until faculty determine admissibility before conducting the international transcript/credential verification. Deans Klomparens and Gibeling can discuss their processes in more detail. Faculty in the units should continue their holistic approach to application review.

For a well-established research university, an application deadline of June 15 prior to the Fall semester is too late. The very best graduate students have offers in hand and make decisions by a nationally-agreed-upon date of April 15 each year. Since UNT is in the development phase, you should consider a discussion in Graduate Council (or in a broad-based task force of graduate program directors) on current application/admission practices. If the Graduate School

receives additional resources to support full-time doctoral students, an earlier date for dispersal of those fellowship funds will provide an incentive for departments to move up their applications deadline, while still being able to accept late applications.

In addition, applications that sit in a department for months or a year are not examples of how to be competitive. As the research culture (connected to, but distinctly different from instruction) develops, the program faculty should have greater responsibility for selecting applicants (with a transcript and institution check for international applicants).

- 5) Possible research-focused services and professional development programs for graduate students are provided below. These services can be offered by the Graduate School with assistance from their student employees and/or by an additional Ph.D. level staff member who has quality oversight responsibility.
- External Fellowship Workshops where students learn about fellowships such as the National Science Foundation Fellowship and the Ford Foundation Diversity Fellowship (NSF come to campuses and give workshops at their expense).
 - Dissertation fellowships for a semester that provide funding to students while they complete their dissertations.
 - Conference and poster presentation skill workshops.
 - Thesis and dissertation support writing groups.
 - Workshops for faculty and students to encourage writing of joint conference papers and articles. Discussion of authorship should be addressed.
 - Promote internal opportunities for students to present their research on campus within their departments, college and campus wide. This could include a Graduate Student Research Conference on an annual basis.
 - Explore dissertation options such as the writing of 3 to 4 journal articles in place of a dissertation (book with chapters). This allows students to understand the process of publishing their work in scholarly journals.
 - Expansion of conference travel awards within departments as well as in the Graduate School.
 - Orientation for Graduate Research Assistants: Topics could include ethics in research, proper conduct in lab settings, library services, requirements of the IRB to conduct research, to name a few.

- Career advice workshops to help students explore all of the alternatives.
 - Add a Future Faculty program, enhance offerings for more experienced TAs/TFs, beyond the 2-day orientation.
 - Add workshops on the responsible conduct of research in collaboration with the Vice President for Research.
- 6) **Communications clearinghouse:** The Graduate School should coordinate efforts to disseminate information about services and workshops offered by several key units on campus such as the Institutional Review Board Office which offers workshops on Research and Ethics, the Library, and Writing centers. In general, it can serve as a clearinghouse of campus resources for graduate students. It can develop a list serve to inform students of resources, seminars, and workshops that take place on campus throughout the academic year. It can also publish a student resource web site on their home page. In general the website should be improved to be of use for continuing students, and not simply a tool for recruitment. The Graduate Student Council would be “happy to assist” in identifying the services and resources that are of interest to graduate students.
- 7) Graduate School staff (especially the Dean and Associate Dean) should share national perspectives and best practices on graduate education by attending the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) annual or summer meeting. Current topics include responsible conduct of research, Ph.D. completion, professional science masters, and European “Bologna” degree equivalence. The annual orientation for new graduate program advisors might be augmented by this additional information for incorporating national best practices into graduate programs.
- 8) The Graduate School should continue to work with UNT student support offices with a goal of better serving graduate students (e.g., IRB, Counseling Center, Health Services, Learning Center, Career Services).
- 9) Re-purpose the thesis/dissertation “reader” function to one of simply ensuring the correct formatting to meet the requirements of ProQuest. This will speed up degree completion and provide part of an FTE to support professional development programs.
- 10) Academic misconduct cases: the Graduate Dean (and/or subcommittee of the Graduate Council) should have a role in final decisions or final appeals. (e.g., MSU Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities document <http://www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/>)

V. What other general advice or comment to you have to assist us as we engage in strategic initiative designed to improve the quality and visibility of graduate education at UNT?

What We Learned

Since Ph.D. education is inextricably linked to research, one report that might be helpful to UNT as they evolve into a research university is The Top American Research Universities. 2006 Annual Report. From: TheCenter for Measuring University Performance (mup.asu.edu). J.V. Lombardi, E.D. Capaldi, C.W. Abbey. A copy of the report was provided to Provost Wilkins.

Snapshots from the 2006 report:

Page 183: UNT is 177th (96th of publics) in annual giving (\$22,823,000) (2005)

Page 199 UNT is 187th (130th of publics) for the number of postdocs (23) (2004)

Page 194 UNT is 111th (75th of publics) for the number of doctoral degrees granted (146) (2005)

Page 207 UNT is 172nd (73rd of publics) for the number of National Merit Scholars (7)

UNT did not appear in the lists of the top 100 institutions for any measure (e.g., research expenditures, federal research dollar expenditures, endowment assets, annual giving, number of postdocs, SAT scores)

The most often-mentioned challenge for UNT's future as a research university was the limited number of and dollar amounts for fellowships and assistantships. The current levels of tuition and fellowship support are appreciated and critical, but are described as "just spreading bread crumbs" to "worse than dismal" and "paltry." "Excellence spread thin is not excellence at all" (Academic Plan). The lack of a minimum standard or boundary conditions for stipends is already detrimental to recruiting, especially at the doctoral level. In addition, the lack of student support funding means that students are either part-time (40% of doctoral students) or are teaching too much (as teaching assistants or teaching fellows). Both conditions limit their ability to engage in research.

While most faculty eagerly look forward to this new growth phase for research and enhanced reputation, a few expressed concern that the additional resources not be invested 100% only in new initiatives, but rather that UNT also invest resources in sustaining quality programs at the master's level. The faculty were also concerned that there were too many undergraduate students and not enough faculty. To focus on research and scholarship, the faculty must have time to devote to these activities.

Interdisciplinary programs are in a growth phase at UNT. The research clusters competition is an excellent example of leadership to promote such programs. Faculty, chairs, and deans did have concerns about potential barriers to such collaboration,

including the dependence on SCHs to allocate resources, the shortage of existing faculty positions, and the reward system. The Academic Plan provides additional commentary on this issue.

Recommendations:

- 1) UNT must expand student support: TA/TF and RAs, as well as fellowships. Each graduate program should make the case for its academic/intellectual contribution to UNT. Fellowships should be allocated based on those contributions. The Graduate School should work with Graduate Council to establish a minimal stipend level and consider establishing levels that reflect experience.

Targeted programs that enhance the “emerging research” designation need to both generate funds to support students as well as receive additional support from UNT. Funds must be strategically invested with subsequent accountability for maximizing positive impact. These funds are needed to enable graduate students to pursue their degrees on a full-time basis, while engaging in research, rather than employment.

- 2) The President and/or Provost should promote a closer working relationship between the VPR and the Graduate School Dean. While this need could be accomplished through an organizational change, it can also be addressed through opportunities to meet individually and through specific councils or staff meetings.
- 3) While the Graduate School expressed an interest in an enrollment manager/data individual, it may be more effective and efficient to partner with the IR office for assessment and outcomes data. These data are critical for decision-making.
- 4) The Graduate School should develop a strategic plan for recruitment, taking into consideration the balance of masters and doctoral students, international students, gender and under-represented minorities that supports a targeted enrollment plan. UNT as a developing research university will not have the national reputation (even if it has a regional reputation) and will need to work at recruitment. Successful recruitment will work only if the support issue is solved.

APPENDIX A

**External Graduate Education Review Committee
Schedule**

Sunday, February 24, 2008

Committee arrives in the afternoon

7:00 p.m. Dinner with Dr. Wilkins in Denton

Monday, February 25, 2008

- 8:20 a.m. External Review Committee is picked up at the Wildwood Inn and transported to campus by Margaret Vestal
- 9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Meeting with Wendy K. Wilkins
Provost Conference Room
- 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Meeting with Sandra Terrell, Dean, Graduate School
Provost Conference Room
- 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Meeting with the Deans
Jeff Gibeling will meet with
- Warren Burggren, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
 - Oscar Garcia, Dean, College of Engineering
- Provost Conference Room*
- Linda Lacey** will meet with
- Finley Graves, Interim Dean, College of Business Administration
 - Tom Evenson, Dean, College of Public Affairs and Community Service
 - Herman Totten, Dean, School of Library and Information Sciences
 - Judith Forney, Dean, School of Merchandising and Hospitality Management
- School of Library and Information Sciences Conference Room – ISB #218*
- Karen Klomparens** will meet with
- James Scott, Dean, College of Music
 - Robert Milnes, Dean, College of Visual Arts and Design
 - Jean Keller, Dean College of Education
- Hurley Administration Building Board Room #204*
- 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. Lunch meeting with Sr. Graduate School Staff
(Larry Schneider, Associate Dean, Donna Hughes, Director Graduate Services and Admissions, Rhonda Ridge, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Dean)
Avesta
- 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Meeting with Graduate Council
Hurley Administration Board Room #204
- 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Meeting with the Graduate Student Council
Hurley Administration Board Room #204
- 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Committee De-brief
Provost Conference Room

TBD

Dinner with Celia Williamson, Vice Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Troy Johnson, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management

Tuesday, February 26, 2008

- 7:30 a.m. External Review Committee breakfast at the Wildwood Inn with Sandra Terrell.
Dr. Terrell will transport the committee to campus.
- 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Provost Conference Room
- 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Meeting with the Associate Deans and Doctoral Graduate Program Advisors
Hurley Administration Building Room #204
- 11:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Meeting with Vish Prasad, Vice President for Research
Hurley Administration Building Room #175
- 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Lunch with the Senior Provost Staff
Provost Conference Room
- 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Committee de-briefing
Provost Conference Room
- 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Exit Meeting with Wendy Wilkins
Provost Conference Room

APPENDIX B

University of North Texas: Evaluating and Enhancing Graduate Education February 25-26, 2008 Discussion-starter questions

Review team:

Karen L. Klomparens, Dean of the Graduate School, Michigan State University
(Plant Biology)

Jeffery Gibeling, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of California, Davis
(Materials Science and Engineering)

Linda Lacey, Dean of the Graduate School, New Mexico State University (City and
Regional Planning)

These suggested questions designed as discussion starters for the group and
individual appointments. Participants are encouraged to bring up additional topics.

Questions for Deans and Associate Deans, Vice President for Research:

Which 2-3 graduate programs in your college are the strongest, highest quality
programs? Why (what criteria do you use to measure quality and success)?

What processes (e.g., program review) are in place in the College and/or the
University to assess program quality? Are these effective at promoting
improvement?

Is there a college strategic plan that addresses graduate program mix of masters and
doctoral programs, certificates, as well as new programs, growth or termination of
current programs?

Which graduate programs are essential in meeting workforce needs for your
community, Texas, U.S. and beyond?

What is or should be the role of the Graduate School in ensuring high quality
graduate programs? For professional development of graduate students (e.g., TA
programs, career planning, conflict resolution, grant writing)?

What functions/roles does the Graduate School currently provide? What would you
like the Graduate School to provide?

What structures and policies are in place at UNT that support interdisciplinary graduate education?

Which research centers on campus are considered the most successful? How are these connected to graduate programs?

What else should we know?

Questions for Graduate Council and Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

What elements/criteria make a top quality graduate program and why? What metrics are appropriate to assess a quality graduate program?

What is the role of the Graduate School at UNT? What do you want the role to be?

What processes (e.g., program review) are in place in the College and/or the University to assess program quality? Are these effective at promoting improvement? What is your role in these processes? What could be changed to promote improvement?

What else should we know?

Questions for Graduate Students:

What is the role of the Graduate School at UNT?

What programs does the Graduate School currently provide to enhance your professional development outside of your discipline? What programs would you like to have?

What are the offices or centers for student support services at UNT? What do they offer? What advice would you give them for improving?

What do you like about your graduate education experience at UNT?

What would you recommend to the Provost as improvements in graduate education?

What else should we know?

Questions for the Graduate Dean and associated personnel:

If we made a set of recommendations to the Provost for improvements in graduate programs, graduate school, and/or graduate education processes, what would your top 3-5 be?

What elements/criteria make a top quality graduate program and why?

What is the role of the Graduate School? What do you want the role to be?

What levels and types of staffing do you require to support the UNT “emerging research university” goal?

What processes (e.g., program review) are in place in the Colleges and/or the University to assess program quality? Are these effective at promoting improvement?

What structures and policies are in place at UNT that support interdisciplinary graduate education?

What else should we know?

Questions for Graduate Program Advisors:

With which universities around the country do you compete for grad students and/or for visibility of your grad programs?

What is the role of the Graduate School? What do you want the role to be?

What processes (e.g., program review) are in place in the College and/or the University to assess program quality? Are these effective at promoting improvement?

What structures and policies are in place at UNT that support interdisciplinary graduate education?

Does your unit have a strategic plan that addresses graduate education? Does it cover growth or termination of existing programs, new programs, workforce needs, placement?

If we made a set of recommendations to the Provost for improvements in graduate programs, graduate school, and/or graduate education processes, what would your top 3-5 be?

What else should we know?