

Emory College of Arts and Sciences Program Review Guidelines

Academic Year 2023-2024

Purpose

Program review provides Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS) departments and programs with an opportunity for self-evaluation; for assessment of their programs; and for articulation of their objectives, goals, and plans. Based upon a thorough consideration of the current state of the department, the process seeks to improve department and program quality by creating a solid plan for the future. A crucial part of the process is to identify and discuss key issues or questions for the unit's future. The in-depth knowledge resulting from program review informs long-term administrative planning and decision-making. For those departments with graduate programs, ECAS and the Laney School of Graduate Studies (LGS) collaborate closely throughout the process and encourage a substantial dialogue among departments/programs and the ECAS and LGS administrations.

Overview of the Process

ECAS's departments and programs (subsequently referred to as departments) are scheduled for program review according to a seven-to-ten-year cycle. Overseen by a small committee of ECAS and LGS deans and administrators, this process comprises three major components, each of which spans at least one semester. A brief overview of the main phases of the review process follows, with each discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of the guidelines.

1. Study and analysis—the self study

The program review process is a shared effort, and the department, ECAS, and LGS will work together to create a review that has benefits for both the department and the administration. The review begins with an orientation meeting, where department faculty, the deans of ECAS and LGS, and other members of the administration consider some of the key issues facing the department. These issues will be covered in the unit's self-study report, a document discussing the current state of the department and the critical opportunities and challenges the unit will face for the next seven to ten years. The self study should be the result of informed collective discussion among the faculty, with a small leadership team assuming responsibility for this semester-long project.

2. External review

A small team of external experts from peer institutions will conduct a two-and-a-half day site visit to review the department in the semester following the self study. The list of potential reviewers is assembled by the administration with input from the department faculty, and the reviewers visit campus under the auspices of ECAS and LGS. The reviewers submit their report to the administration, and it is shared with the department faculty.

3. Follow-up and continuation

The department, ECAS, and LGS leadership will work together to define the next steps for each unit based on its needs and the review. Following a focused discussion with departmental leadership, ECAS and LGS deans will write a memorandum of understanding that summarizes the review findings and documents the follow-up plan discussed in the meeting. Resource allocation is not commonly an immediate or direct result of program review, which is focused on the department's scholarly mission, rather than its budget. New or re-appointed chairs will review program review documents at time of their appointment and will discuss progress and any suggested adjustments to goals during the annual planning sessions that year.

Study and analysis—key issues and the self study

During the first semester of the review, the department will write a self study. The self study drives the review process, and it should express the unit's unique culture, reflect on its strengths and limitations, define goals and objectives, and develop plans to work toward its goals for the next seven-to-ten years. The self study should be comprehensive in scope (i.e. it should cover all of a department's programs, structures, and activities). Within this framework the faculty, in conjunction with the administration, will identify a small number of key issues (roughly 3–4) for more extensive discussion and analysis. A key issue is a question, concern, or opportunity with potential to have a significant impact on the department or field within the next 5–7 years.

The College and LGS deans and departmental faculty will discuss potential key issues and work together to identify the priorities for the review at the orientation meeting, which is discussed below. Before the orientation, the chair should meet with the faculty to consider the key issues facing the department. The issues may be new or emerging questions or long-standing challenges facing the department or field that would benefit from feedback. The associate director of program review can provide additional guidance to the department on identifying key issues.

After the orientation, the associate director of program review will send the chair the list of key issues generated during the meeting. The chair will draft a brief document that provides more detailed context regarding the issues and potential questions for reviewers and return it within two weeks to the associate director of program review. Key issues can be in the form of bullet points or paragraphs and the document should be no more than 1–2 pages. This document will be reviewed by the program review committee, in conversation with the senior College and LGS deans, and confirmation of agreement to the key issues will be sent to the chair.

Program review provides an opportunity for self-reflection, and most departments have found this reflection to be one of the most valuable aspects of the process. The serious consideration of the department's intellectual self-definition and its sense of its place in the discipline are particularly significant aspects of the review process. The self study should be based on extensive discussions among faculty, with input from staff and undergraduate and graduate students, and consider the current state of the unit. Faculty discussions that provide the basis for the self study, and the self study itself, should address the data gathered for the self study (discussed in detail in Appendix A). These data are essential to a full consideration of the department and in many cases will provide points of reference as the department develops or refines its plans to work towards its objectives and goals.

Program review is also a means by which a department can rigorously consider its future directions. We encourage the department to be clear and specific about its objectives and plans to achieve them, as more specific proposals have yielded the most useful feedback. Key issues addressed during the review should correspond with the department's strategic goals for future directions. It is understandable that some of a department's plans for improvement may depend on new resources, but the department should take care to define plans that can be achieved through current resources as well. The self study should focus on strategic choices and directions, with the understanding that goals will be met primarily with existing resources. We encourage the department to consider whether existing resources can be reallocated to better support department priorities.

Orientation meeting

After the department has been notified that it will undergo review, the faculty and staff will meet with members of the ECAS and LGS senior leadership to discuss the program review process. The meeting will cover program review goals, possible outcomes, and particular issues to be thoroughly addressed in the review. The conversation will help the department and the administration develop a set of shared goals and priorities that are tailored to the individual department as it undertakes the review process.

Leadership team

Encouraging faculty discussion of major questions for the department, or the field, and assembling the resulting self study require significant work, as the self study spans all aspects of the unit and its programs. The chair should appoint a self-study leadership team and provide the names of the team members to the associate director of program review with the document outlining key issues for the review. The leadership team will guide the study and analysis of the unit. Often the leadership team will consist of the Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Graduate Studies, but other configurations that are better suited to an individual department will be supported. While the leadership team assumes responsibility for the completion of the self study, the report should be the result of shared conversations among faculty and all members of the department faculty must have access to the report before it is submitted to the program review office. In cases where there is no consensus about major questions, the self study should represent the differing points of view among faculty members.

The unit's report

The self-study report should be limited to 30-35 pages, excluding appendices. A brief executive summary (1-2 pages) highlighting the major issues addressed in the self study should accompany the document. A complete electronic copy of the self study and all other supporting materials should be submitted to the office of program review at least eight (8) weeks before the review team's campus visit, with the specific deadline to be established by the chair and the associate director of program review.

The self study should cover all the department's programs. The contents of the self study will be determined by the unit's individual needs, and most will include the following major areas:

1. Executive Summary (1-2 pages)
 - a. Briefly describe department's mission and organization. Include a list of programs, degrees offered, research areas, and scholarly activities.
 - b. State goals for the review, including the key issues to address.
2. Introduction and Overview
 - a. State the department's mission and vision
 - b. Describe how the department is organized (scholarly areas of focus, concentrations, etc.) for research and teaching purposes.
 - c. Describe the current state of the department, including number of faculty by rank, size and scope of both undergraduate and graduate programs, and its major activities. Comparison data either related to the key issues or as context on the department within the field should be considered, if relevant. Please work with ECAS and LGS to discuss metrics and types of data that may be useful for the self study and to identify likely peer institutions.
 - d. Provide a brief history of the department since its most recent program review. State the major recommendations from the previous review. The purpose of including this section is to address any outstanding issues and acknowledge changes based on the prior review. Are any review findings still relevant?
 - e. Key Issues
 - i. Elaborate on each key issue identified at the beginning of the review process. Discuss each issue, including any necessary history to understand the issue and the possible impact of the issue on the program's future.
 - ii. Provide any suggestions that you have for resolution of the key issue.

- iii. Include any specific questions for the external review committee.
 - f. Explain the process of conducting the self study and assembling the resulting report.
- 3. Governance and operations
 - a. Explain the departmental governance and committee structure.
 - b. Describe the department's culture and its decision-making processes.
 - i. What is the internal policy for making teaching assignments and deciding teaching loads?
 - ii. How are mentoring and advising responsibilities distributed across the faculty, for all levels of student and faculty mentoring?
 - iii. Describe any collaborative centers or programs that play a significant role in the department's scholarly endeavors. Discuss goals and outcomes for the centers or programs.
 - c. Describe staff positions and the staff members' departmental roles and responsibilities.
 - i. If there have been any recent changes to staff or staffing responsibilities, please provide information on how and why they have changed.
 - ii. How do staff and faculty interact, collaborate, and share responsibility for administration of the department?
 - d. Evaluate the department's infrastructure (space, computer support, library resources, teaching and research laboratories, etc.).
- 4. Departmental scholarship and research
 - a. Describe the unit's intellectual and scholarly areas of focus.
 - i. What are the department's distinctive research strengths? Discuss the ways in which these strengths support the unit's scholarly mission and its undergraduate and graduate curricula.
 - ii. Describe the unit's grant activity, including faculty grants, graduate student grants,
 - iii. and training grants. What steps does the department take to promote grant activity?
 - iv. What is the scope of research coverage? Does the department have significant areas of research or teaching strength or weakness?
 - v. How does the department engage with traditions and trends in the discipline?
 - vi. Identify any new areas of research strength that need to be developed and what they will contribute to the department and the campus.
 - b. Consider the department's intellectual interests and position in the discipline as a whole.
 - c. Discuss the unit's role within ECAS, LGS, and the University. What are the department's connections to other campus units (and beyond)? How do they serve the unit's mission? Identify any collaborations you hope to develop in the future.
- 5. Faculty Development and Excellence
 - a. Composition of faculty.
 - i. Describe the current distribution of faculty across professional ranks.
 - ii. Describe changes in the regular faculty during the past seven years (recruitment, losses, progression through ranks, tenure and promotion cases). Please note: unsuccessful tenure cases should not identify the candidate by name.
 - iii. What is the department's ethnic and gender diversity as a whole and broken down by professional rank? How does it relate to aggregate divisional and College demographics?
 - b. Recruitment and professional development.
 - i. Discuss the department's efforts to recruit and retain excellent faculty. How do these

- efforts encourage faculty diversity?
- ii. How does the department recruit, mentor, and retain junior faculty? How does the department support assistant professors as they develop their career trajectories?
 - iii. How does the department foster continuing professional development for tenured and lecture-track faculty members?
- c. Characterize the activities of the faculty, covering the following:
- i. Research: publications, presentations, grant activity
 - 1. What is the depth and quality of faculty research?
 - 2. Describe how you regard the visibility of faculty research.
 - ii. Teaching: teaching and advising or mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.
 - 1. How are undergraduate- and graduate-level teaching shared by tenure-track, lecture-track, temporary, part-time faculty, and graduate students?
 - 2. Discuss the distribution of advising or mentoring responsibilities across tenure-track and lecture-track faculty.
 - iii. Service: to the department, ECAS, University, and profession.
- d. Highlight faculty achievements, including publications, presentations, grants, and awards. Discuss faculty members' scholarly contributions to the field. Describe the visibility and recognition of faculty members' contributions within the field (invited presentations, memberships in honorary societies, honors, awards, citations, and other markers of professional standing).
6. Undergraduate programs
- a. Describe the undergraduate student population and the intellectual atmosphere for majors.
 - i. Describe goals for diversity, equity, and inclusion and how you monitor and assess your progress.
 - ii. How does your undergraduate curriculum contribute to the overall liberal arts mission?
 - b. Consider the undergraduate majors(s) and minor(s) offered by the unit.
 - i. Summarize trends in majors and enrollment.
 - ii. What are the programs' greatest strengths? Which areas need additional attention?
 - c. Discuss the undergraduate curriculum.
 - i. What are the course requirements for majors and minors?
 - ii. Review any recent changes to the major or minor as well as any changes planned for the near future.
 - iii. Characterize the breadth and depth of undergraduate course offerings.
 - iv. How do you balance the needs of providing courses for majors with courses for non-majors, including GER requirements?
 - d. Explain the system for advising undergraduate majors.
 - e. Evaluate the student experience.
 - i. How do students view their undergraduate experience? You may use any existing student surveys (Emory senior survey, National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), etc.), or you can conduct an undergraduate student survey for your review.
 - ii. Address the opportunities for undergraduate research in your program. Is there a capstone experience or research requirement? What percent of majors participates in research? Describe research opportunities that are not course-based.
 - iii. Describe the Honors Program. How many students participate in Honors?
 - iv. If there are other significant components of the undergraduate program, such as study abroad, field studies, internship requirements, or other experiential learning opportunities, describe these aspects of the program as well.

- f. Are students achieving the goals of the major(s)? Describe your learning assessment plans; discuss recent results and how you have used those results to modify the curriculum.
- g. How do alumni view their undergraduate experience? What sorts of careers or continued education do your majors pursue following graduation from Emory?

7. Graduate programs

a. Program Profile

- i. Identify and describe the graduate program(s) offered by the unit.
 - 1. Address all graduate certificates, masters, PhD, and joint degree programs.
 - 2. Discuss any recent or anticipated changes to the program(s).
- ii. Thinking about your discipline(s) as a whole, what would you say are the hallmarks of quality graduate education? How does the program meet these standards?
- iii. Discuss the objectives of your graduate program, including but not limited to goals for diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - 1. How do you monitor and assess your progress?
 - 2. Specifically, we would like to invite you to consider a few issues:
 - a. How do you assess whether your students feel like they are in inclusive academic community?
 - b. How do you assess your program's impact on student success?

b. Curriculum

- i. Are there sufficient course offerings and balance among offerings? How are courses coordinated?
- ii. Are courses cross-listed? Do students take courses offered by other graduate programs? If so, are there particular courses that meet students' needs? Do students from other graduate programs enroll in your courses?
- iii. Describe other aspects of graduate education and training: advising, teaching training, teaching requirements, professionalization efforts, etc.
- iv. Discuss the intersection of graduate training and the undergraduate curriculum.
- v. How do you assess the quality of your curriculum?

c. Program Governance

- i. Understanding that some graduate programs are aligned fully with a College Department while others are not, please describe how your graduate program is governed and administered.
- ii. Describe the process, if one exists, for reviewing faculty membership in the Laney Graduate School.

d. Admissions

- i. Describe the recruitment and admissions processes for both masters degrees and PhDs.
 - 1. How do you evaluate your process?
 - 2. How do you evaluate variation in recruiting success?
 - 3. What steps does the program take to attract, recruit, and retain excellent and diverse candidates?

e. Student Success

- i. How do you assess student success in your program?
 - 1. What role does the quality of a student's scholarship play in this assessment? Aside from the dissertation, what other types of scholarship do you expect students to produce while in your program?
 - 2. What sorts of careers do graduates pursue? How do you evaluate graduate

placement?

8. Goals, Plans, and Resources

- a. Identify the department's goals for the next five-to-ten years.
- b. Describe the department's vision for the future and discuss the issues the unit must address in order to thrive. Identify priorities for addressing these issues and any improvements (both ongoing and specific initiatives) the department intends to make.
- c. Discuss any changes to priorities and the potential ways to support them within the current resource envelope through re-allocations, alterations to other programming, or other methods.
- d. How can you use resources that are unique to Emory (location, alignment with university or college strategic plans, regional connections, campus connections, etc.) to achieve your goals?
- e. How will you measure your progress? Which data will be helpful as you evaluate your progress?

Data: The self study will contain data to support the department's narrative. The data requested should contribute to the understanding of the department's governance and operations, faculty and research, the undergraduate program, and the graduate program and are discussed in detail Appendix A. While ECAS and LGS currently provides some data, we can also work with the department to find other data relevant to the department's narrative, if requested.

External review

The review of the department is conducted by a team of external experts who are able to view the program within the larger context of the discipline and provide feedback based on their knowledge of the field and their experiences at peer institutions. We seek distinguished scholars who are recognized leaders in their fields to conduct a rigorous, independent, and informed review of the department. During the previous cycles of reviews, many departments received useful advice from the review committee and used the reviewers' insights to help implement meaningful changes. The members of the review committee are reimbursed for travel expenses and receive honoraria for their service.

Selection of reviewers

Reviewers are identified through an indirect nomination process. As soon as a department has been notified of its program review, the department is asked to provide the office of program review with a list of 15–20 individuals from whom to request nominations for external reviewers. Chairs of peer departments, editors of major journals, officers of professional organizations, and other leaders in the field are ideal recommenders; recommenders may also nominate themselves to serve as reviewers. The office of program review will solicit recommendations from the individuals named on the department's list and return to the department the resulting list of potential reviewers. We ask that department faculty carefully review the list of potential reviewers and eliminate anyone who might have close ties to or a conflict of interest with the department.

The associate director of program review will seek the department's advice regarding the coverage of disciplinary subfields and possibly other qualifications of potential reviewers as well. The program review committee selects and invites the reviewers while the office of program review provides logistical support to assemble the review committee, finalize the visit schedule, and coordinate travel plans for the review committee.

Materials to be sent to reviewers

The unit's self study will be forwarded to the reviewers at least four weeks prior to the review team's visit. The office of program review will supplement the self study with additional materials, including the program review guidelines, course catalogs, and the University, ECAS, and LGS strategic plans. A week before the site visit,

ECAS will send the reviewers a draft of the review schedule and a letter outlining the charge to the external review team.

External review visit

The external reviewers visit campus for two and a half days and will meet with the department's faculty, staff, undergraduate and graduate students, and any other members of the Emory community who could help provide a broader context for the program under review. The committee's first meeting is with the ECAS and LGS leadership. During the second day and the morning of the third day, the reviewers will meet with the members of the department under review. The reviewers must meet with the following constituencies: all regular faculty (with separate meetings reserved for untenured, tenure-track faculty); staff members; undergraduate students; related or collaborative units; and graduate students, if the faculty participate in graduate education. The visit schedule also reserves a significant amount of work time for the review committee. Before leaving on the third day, the committee will have a final exit interview with members of the ECAS and LGS leadership. The associate director of program review will work with the department chair and staff to design the review visit schedule.

The office of program review will be responsible for all of the reviewers' travel and lodging arrangements and expenses. During the campus visit the department will be responsible for transportation between campus and the hotel (usually the Emory Conference Center) and for arranging the reviewers' meals. At the beginning of the semester of the external review, ECAS will deposit funds into the department's primary operations account (E & G account) to cover meal expenses during the reviewers' visit.

Charge letter and external review report

A week before the campus visit the charge for the review will be sent to external committee members. The charge asks general questions about the department's programs, governance, research and scholarship, and teaching, similar to those asked of the program in the self-study guidelines (pages 3–7); the charge letter will also address the key issues that are emphasized in the self study. All charge letters request that the committee not use the review as an opportunity to advocate for additional resources for the department.

The external review committee will submit its report to the associate director of program review within 30 days of its campus visit. The report should address the questions specified in the charge letter and offer a general consideration of the department, including a clear statement about its strengths and limitations, its teaching programs, its research profile within the field, and the appropriateness of its goals and its plans to achieve them. The external reviewers' report is a crucial part of the program review process, but it is not the final statement of the department's merits or the final word in the review process. The reviewers' report is shared with the ECAS, LGS, and University leadership, as well as the faculty of the unit under review. The report is treated as a confidential document and should not be widely circulated.

Error-of-fact report

Once the report has been forwarded to the chair, the department has two weeks to review it for errors of fact. The chair should report all factual errors to the associate director of program review, who will append the error-of-fact report to the reviewers' report. The error-of-fact report should focus upon factual mistakes, not questions of interpretation. Should faculty have serious concerns about the report, the post-review meeting will provide a forum for a fuller discussion (see below). Should the report contain no factual errors, the chair should notify the associate director of program review that the report does not require corrections.

Follow-up and continuation

Post-review meeting and memorandum of understanding

Soon after the faculty has read the review report and sent its error-of-fact report, the unit's self-study leadership team will meet with the Dean of ECAS, the Dean of LGS, and other members of the administration to consider the review process, including the external reviewers' report. The meeting is an opportunity for an open conversation among department, ECAS, and LGS leadership, allowing all parties to reach a collective understanding of the department's strengths, limitations, goals, and priorities. The objectives of this meeting are several: as part of an ongoing conversation, it will help the administration find ways to better support the unit; it will provide a forum to discuss the unit's needs in the context of ECAS's and LGS's goals and priorities; and it will allow ECAS, LGS, and the department to agree upon next steps for the department. The chair will receive a memorandum of understanding from the ECAS and LGS deans commenting upon the unit's review and detailing the agreed upon steps toward achieving the department's goals and the projected timeline for achieving these goals. The deans' memo may discuss questions that involve resources, but the deans will not make substantial resource commitments in the memo, as such commitments are considered part of the overall budgeting process. From this point forward, management of program review follow-up will become the responsibility of the administration and the chair, rather than the self-study leadership team.

Continuation after program review

Any follow-up tasks that need to occur immediately or within the first year after program review will be detailed in the final dean's memo sent to the department. Additional follow up will be folded into subsequent annual reporting or planning sessions, as needed.

Appointment or re-appointment of the department chair will be an opportunity to revisit goals set during the review process. At that time, the chair will be asked to review the dean's memo from the last program review and consider its relevance to current state of department. The office of program review is able to provide copies of the memo or any other program review documents that the chair requests. The program review outcomes will be discussed in the College and LGS annual planning sessions that year to review progress, acknowledge accomplishments, and adjust goals.

The guidelines for this cycle of program review (beginning fall 2022) respond to comments made by faculty and staff as they evaluated the previous cycle of program review. We hope that departments find that these changes enhance the process. Cheri Kersey, Associate Director of Program Review, welcomes your questions and comments about the process. Please contact her at cokerse@emory.edu or 727-0856.

Appendix A

Most self studies should include the following data, most of which can be found in faculty CVs and the department's annual reports to ECAS (planning session documents, OARS, and Faculty 180) and LGS. Not all of the requested data will apply to every department. Conversely, some departments may wish to provide additional data as part of the self study. ECAS, within the limits of current systems, may be able to provide some data or other support for the compilation of data. Please contact the office of program review to discuss this possibility.

Some of the data requested below is referred to or requested in the self-study questions on pages 3–6 of the guidelines. Data that is presented in the self-study narrative need not be duplicated in the data section.

1. Governance and operations

- A. List department committees, current members, and frequency of meetings.
- B. Provide staff job descriptions.

2. Faculty and research

- A. Provide the number of tenure-track and lecture-track faculty by rank for 2018-19 to 2022-23 (ECAS data).
- B. Provide numerical data on the gender and racial/ethnic composition of the faculty for 2018-19 to 2022-23 (ECAS data).
- C. Summarize the changes in faculty rank (including new hires and departures) and progression within tenure- and lecture-track ranks for 2018-19 to 2022-23 (ECAS data).
- D. Submit current and complete curriculum vitae for all faculty associated with the program.
 - a. Faculty CVs will be the primary source of data about individual faculty members and much of the standard information found in CVs will not be requested elsewhere.
 - b. Faculty scholarship: Each member of the regular faculty should provide a brief description of his or her three most significant scholarly achievements, similar to the listings on individual faculty member's webpages. Present these data alphabetically by faculty member within faculty rank.
- E. Faculty awards and honorary societies: List by faculty name and date for 2018-19 to 2022-23.
- F. External Research Funds: 2018-19 to 2022-23 (ECAS data, though limited).
 - a. Provide data on total external research funds by faculty and graduate students for each year. Provide the name of the funding source; the type of source (federal, foundation, etc.); the dates of the grant; the grant amount; and the indirect cost rate.
 - b. Identify any training grants and the number of students they support.
 - c. Provide data on internal awards (i.e., University Research Committee (URC) grants) by faculty for each year.

3. Undergraduate program

- A. Students: Provide the numbers of majors and honors students, and list student awards from 2018-19 through 2022-23 (ECAS data).
 - a. It is recommended that you provide results from any existing student surveys like the student exit survey or surveys created for program review.
- B. Course offerings: Provide data on courses and enrollments in the form of a table. For each course list course number and title, instructor's name and rank, enrollment, and overall course evaluation mean for courses from 2018-19 through 2022-23 (ECAS data; see sample template below).
 - a. Indicate if courses are cross-listed.
 - b. Identify courses that fulfill GER requirements with the appropriate code (**ETHN**: Race and Ethnicity; **FSEM**: First-Year Seminar; **FWRT**: First-Year Writing; **WRT**: Continuing Writing; **MQR**: Math & Quantitative

Reasoning; **SNT**: Science, Nature, Technology; **HSC**: History, Society, Cultures; **HAP**: Humanities, Arts, and Performance; **HAL**: Humanities, Arts, and Language; **HTH**: Personal Health; **PED**: Physical Education and Dance).

Course data sample template

Semester	Course #	Course title	Instructor	Rank	Enrollment	Evaluation mean	Cross-listed	GER
Spring 20	XXX 141	Introduction to X	Smith	Sr. Lecturer	57	7.9	YYY150	
Spring 20	XXX 190	X through time	Jones	Assoc. Prof	12	8.4		FSEM

- C. Teaching distribution: Indicate the percentage of courses and of students taught by each of the following categories: tenure-track faculty, lecture-track faculty, part-time or temporary faculty, and graduate students, 2018-19 through 2022-23 (ECAS data).
- D. Provide a summary of departmental assessment reports or plans from spring 2018–spring 2023.
- E. Handbook for majors.

4. Graduate Program

- A. Applications and admissions: number of completed applications, number of students offered admission, number of students accepting admission, selectivity and yield for the past 5 years (2018-19 to 2022-23); for each student who declined admission, indicate school attended (available on LGS public dashboard - <https://www.gs.emory.edu/academics/data/index.html>).
- B. Composition of student body: What is the current gender and race/ethnicity composition of the unit's graduate students? What is the percentage of international students (LGS dashboard)?
- C. Attrition/Retention: number of students leaving the program before completion of Ph.D., by year in program, for cohorts of students beginning in 2012-13 through 2020-2021 (from LGS dashboard). Note the number of students dropped from the program for each year.
- D. Completion and time to degree for the most recent five academic years (LGS dashboard).
- E. Current student mentoring and advising: list the advisors and committee members for currently enrolled students by faculty member (Tableau).
- F. Completed Ph.D. and Masters' Theses: list by faculty member, indicate if faculty member was an advisor or a committee member, and provide student's name and title of thesis for years 2018-19 through 2022-23 (available from LGS).
- G. Placement: List first job placement since Ph.D. degree and current placement, by employment sector, for students completing their degrees from 2018-19 to 2022-23 (from LGS Annual Report).
- H. Student publications: list with full citation for years 2018-19 through 2022-23.
- I. Student awards: external fellowships, honors, etc. for years 2018-19 through 2022-23.
- J. Courses: list courses by year, include instructor's name and rank, course enrollment, and indicate if the course is cross-listed for years 2018-19 to 2022-23. Similar data is also requested for the department's undergraduate courses, and the course offering charts may be combined, if the department prefers.
- K. Provide a summary of graduate program assessment reports or plans from spring 2018–spring 2023.
- L. Graduate Student Handbook.