Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: Doctoral

The Graduate Review & Improvement Process (GRIP)

Henning Schroeder

Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Education University of Minnesota

CGS Annual Meeting | 12.05.12



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Driven to Discover[™]



- GRIP is a student-centered and action-oriented program assessment project
- Puts evaluation & program improvement in the hands of students, faculty and staff

Where it Began

Graduate Professional and Education Assembly University of Minnesota

Academic Program Evaluation

Monday, April 18, 2011 The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate

Keynote speakers:

Chris Golde Stanford University

George Walker Cleveland State University



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Driven to Discover⁵⁴⁴

Why?

External Review: Every 5 to 10 years Summative

- Experts in the field
- Self-study report
- Exit interview

Previously administered by the Graduate School

Internal Ongoing Improvement Process

Developmental

- Systematic listening to student and faculty input
- Ongoing adjustment of educational activities to program goals
- Bottom-up approach to quality metrics

Measuring from the Bottom-Up

- In FY12/13, Graduate School funding allocations to colleges were based on discipline-independent, quantitative measures (time to degree, completion/attrition, placement)
- GRIP allows programs to define discipline-specific metrics & outcomes using qualitative data



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Driven to Discover⁵⁵⁴

Qualitative Measures & Methods

- Measuring intangibles in graduate education & research
 - How can we measure **originality and innovation**?
 - How do we quantify **intellectual risk-taking**?
 - How will we gauge opportunities to "fail or explore dead ends"?
 - How should we evaluate the crossing of disciplinary boundaries?
- Methodology
 - Focus groups, interviews, town hall meetings, etc.
 - Content analysis of results (e.g. MAXQDA, qualitative data analysis)



Content Analysis Tool

- Allows for content analysis of focus groups and interviews
- Word counts; recurring themes; demographic analysis

<mark>ר 1</mark>	documents (126	74 words total)		2793 W
9 2 3 0				
	Word	Word length	Trequency	%
•	education	9	128	1.01
+	learning	8	125	0.99
÷	universities	12	113	0.89
•	support	7	100	0.79
+	colleges	8	100	0.79
+	funding	7	94	0.74
+	skills	6	80	0.63
+	work	4	75	0.59
+	higher	6	73	0.58
+	provision	9	71	0.56
+	students	8	71	0.56
•	university	10	71	0.56
+	research	8	70	0.55
•	sector	6	66	0.52
+	training	8	65	0.51
+	government	10	64	0.51
+	people	6	64	0.51
+	needs	5	63	0.50
+	learners	8	55	0.43
+	college	7	52	0.41
+	student	7	51	0.40
+	employers	9	49	0.39

What Do We Hope to Learn?

- What is the *purpose* of the program?
 - What are the desired outcomes?
- What is the *rationale and educational purpose* of each element of the program?
 - Which elements of the program should be retained and affirmed?
 - Which elements could usefully be changed or eliminated?
- How do you know?
 - What *evidence* aids in answering those questions?
 - What evidence can be collected to determine whether changes serve the desired outcomes?

Source: "The Challenges of Doctoral Program Assessment: Lessons from the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate," Chris M. Golde, Laura Jones, Andrea Conklin Bueschel, George E. Walker

What Are the Benefits?

- For participating programs: Gain evaluation skills and experiences appropriate to their discipline and organizational context
- For faculty: Develop strategies for clearly and effectively articulating program goals, standards, and achievements to diverse audiences
- For students: Gain evaluation expertise that will give them a voice in shaping the future direction of the discipline and allow them to develop skills applicable to their future careers, both academic and non-academic. Use for dissertations. Students benefit from the review while they are still in the program

Sampling of Findings

- Only one out of almost 50 students who participated in focus groups in one department expressed an aspiration to be a faculty member at an R1 institution
- Focus group participants described two "castes" of students, with the line falling between those who have graduate assistantships and those who do not
- Students questioned the number of courses required for a Ph.D. degree, which they claimed was over 30% more than comparable programs and allowed little time for academic research
- All students who are in a cohort expressed satisfaction with their program, and all who are not in a cohort wished they were

Implementing GRIP

- **Eight programs volunteered** for GRIP, from the following colleges:
 - Carlson School of Management
 - College of Education & Human Development
 - College of Food, Agricultural & Natural Resource Sciences
 - College of Pharmacy
 - College of Science & Engineering
 - College of Veterinary Medicine
 - Humphrey School of Public Affairs
 - School of Dentistry

Challenges

- **Decentralized model** of graduate education
- Reluctance to invest in program review
- Combination with undergraduate education
 program review
- 2015 accreditation of the U of MN Twin Cities campus

GRIP Investment

- Graduate School contributed a one-time investment of \$80,000 to fund:
 - Graduate assistants serving as consultants to the eight participating pilot programs
 - Publication/presentation costs
 - Minnesota Evaluation Studies Institute (MESI)
- Plus student, faculty & staff time from participating programs
- We are implementing the program with resources that we already have on campus (e.g., College of Education & Human Development; graduate assistants)

GRIP Pilot Project Includes:

- Workshops on program evaluation
- Graduate evaluation colloquium for student leaders
- Resources/toolkit (survey instruments, focus group protocols)
- **Consulting assistance** from University experts in higher education and program evaluation, including the Minnesota Evaluation Studies Institute (MESI)





Thank you.

Questions?





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Driven to Discoversm