University of Washington The Graduate School

Individual Ph.D. Program

Self-Study September 2002

Table of Contents

| Description of Unit | |
|---|------|
| Program Statistics | |
| Recommendations from 1993 Review and Program's response | |
| Current Students | |
| Dissertation proposal Student Resume | |
| Supervisory Committee Student Data | |
| CV of Committee Chair | |
| Graduates Since Last Review (1993-2002) Abstract | V |
| Supervisory Committee Student Data | |
| Students Who Did Not Complete Their Programs Supervisory Committee Student Data | VI. |
| Standing Review Committee Membership | VII |
| Program Materials General Description Application Materials Annual Progress Report Committee Meeting Report Program Manual | VIII |
| Appendices Enrollment Statistics | IX |
| HEC Board Summary | |

Individual PhD (IPhD) Program Self Study 2002

Preface

This is the Individual PhD (IPhD) Program's second review since its inception in the late 1960s. This self study will address the Program's role within the University of Washington (UW), the changes that have been made to the Program in response to recommendations put forward by the 1993 review committee, and the need for potential additional changes.

Throughout most of its history, the Program's success was measured by the number of students admitted and graduated who would not otherwise have been able to do so in a traditional UW PhD degree-offering unit. Over the past 9 years, however, the number of IPhD applicants and enrolled students has substantially declined. At the time of the last review, there were 12 enrolled students. At present, the Program enrolls two students, with no new students entering Autumn Quarter, 2002. The growing concern, which we ask the review committee to address, is whether or not the need for a program of this type still exists. Has the University culture changed sufficiently so as to allow PhD degree-offering units to accommodate the interdisciplinary programs that previously were directed to the IPhD Program? Is it important for the University to continue the program in order to accommodate unique individuals who cannot find a disciplinary home? If the IPhD Program is to continue, what changes should be made to strengthen it?

Our goal is to provide you with information to assess the Program's current structure in hopes that you will determine whether or not there is a continuing need for this Program. Should you recommend that the Program remain in existence, we hope you will offer counsel on ways to strengthen the applicant pool and to ensure that those enrolled will be well mentored and will have a high quality degree program.

I. Description of Unit

The IPhD Program is a PhD degree-offering unit administered by the Graduate School. The Program is directed by the Dean of the Graduate School, managed by a Coordinator (approximately 10 -15% of a full time workload) and reviewed annually by a Standing Review Committee (see Section VII) comprised of faculty from a variety of disciplines. The Program was created over 30 years ago with the first degree granted in 1970. A total of 112 degrees have been granted to date.

The Program's primary role is to offer opportunities for exceptionally able students in high academic standing to achieve a PhD in areas of study where other UW PhD degree-offering units cannot accommodate the students due to the highly interdisciplinary nature of their programs. This special program allows students to integrate coursework and recruit supervisory committee members from two or more UW PhD degree-offering units so as to form a program of study without having to satisfy each academic unit's individual requirements. Though there are a number of Canadian universities that offer similar programs (the closest being the University of British Columbia), the IPhD is unique both within the UW and nationally.

Detailed descriptions of the program and the application process are included in Section VIII.

Application Process

The Program has a rigorous application process, unlike that of any other UW PhD degree-offering unit. In addition to having to outline a detailed course of study, applicants must recruit a doctoral supervisory committee and submit a detailed dissertation plan, steps which most students are not required to take until their second year of study.

Complete applications (with the exception of letters of evaluation and recommendation) must be submitted by December 15th; admission notices are sent by May 31st for autumn quarter enrollment. This extensive review period is necessary because applications are reviewed at a number of levels. First, they are evaluated by Graduate Program Coordinators (GPCs – faculty advisors) in each UW PhD degree-offering unit that would be involved in the applicant's proposed program. (Units involved are determined based upon the home departments of members of the proposed supervisory committee.) The GPCs are asked to indicate whether the applicant would be competitive for admission to their department, whether the proposed course of study could be accomplished within their departmental program, and whether the applicant has previously applied for admission to their department. Second, a group of faculty (usually 2-3) is selected to review the application, particularly the statement of research, for overall quality and likelihood of success. Finally, the Standing Review Committee reviews the application packets and the evaluator comments. The Committee then interviews each applicant and makes a determination as to whether or not to extend an offer of admission.

Program Requirements

The Program's minimum credit requirements are the basic Graduate School requirements for all PhD degree-offering units, as listed in the UW Graduate School Catalog. Additional requirements are outlined in the <u>Program Manual</u> (see Section VIII).

Once a student is admitted, he/she is required to convene a supervisory committee meeting during the first quarter of study. This meeting allows the student and committee members to re-evaluate and refine the proposed course of study, determine the format of the Qualifying (if appropriate), General and Final Examinations and agree upon a tentative examination schedule. An <u>IPhD Supervisory Committee Meeting Report</u> form (see Section VIII) is then signed by the committee and the student and submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School for approval.

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of this program, the supervisory committee is even more important than it is for students in a disciplinary program. IPhD supervisory committees are responsible for ensuring that coursework and research requirements are complete, determining the format for examinations and ensuring that General and Final examinations are completed in a timely manner. More importantly, committee members must help the student acquire sufficient grounding and sophistication in each of their respective disciplines so as to be able to accomplish a high quality piece of interdisciplinary research. Committee chairs have the responsibility of submitting an annual progress report to the Standing Review Committee. Students have the responsibility of convening a committee meeting at least once a year and submitting an annual progress report to the Standing Review Committee.

In winter quarter, the Dean of the Graduate School hosts an event for all Program participants (students, faculty, recent alumni and the Standing Review Committee). This event was initiated as a vehicle by which to build camaraderie among the students and to create a support network for participants.

Students

Subsequent sections of this report provide data on currently enrolled students (Section IV), students who have graduated in the years since the last review (Section V), and students from the same period who left the program without completing their degrees (Section VI). For the currently enrolled students and those who have graduated, these sections provide summaries of the students proposed (current students) or completed (graduates) dissertation projects. These abstracts should help the committee visualize the range of topics and degree of interdisciplinarity represented by these students. The sections also contain data on the students' supervisory committees, again with the goal of helping the committee to assess the degree to which these students draw on a variety of disciplines to conduct their work. Finally, the sections contain information on

While it is difficult to describe the "typical" IPhD student, the students have tended to be independent, innovative individuals who want to work well beyond the bounds of recognized disciplines. Many of them are working adults who have come back to graduate school after first having established themselves in a professional field. The Program also, at times, has met the needs of students in fields for which the University does/did not have a PhD program (e.g. Public Affairs, Nursing). Until 1996-97, there were more full time students than part time (Appendix A). For the past few years, that pattern has reversed. Relatively equal numbers of male and female students have taken advantage of the Program. The Program has also attracted a number of students of color.

Student Involvement in the Program

Because students in this Program do not have a home department, they often do not have access to the sorts of support networks that more traditional students have. To address that need, the Graduate School has sought ways to create community.

In autumn quarter, students meet as a group with the Program's Coordinator to discuss any problems that have arisen within their individual programs, discuss possible formats for the winter quarter event (see below), and provide general recommendations to better the Program. It was in one of these meetings that the students proposed that the Program change its name from "Special Individual PhD" to "Individual PhD". The proposal was submitted to and approved by the Dean of the Graduate School. In some years, students who met one another through this meeting volunteered to be resources for prospective students, they networked among themselves using e-mail and the web and informally gathered for support sessions.

In winter quarter, the Graduate School hosts a program that combines some sort of scholarly presentation(s) with a social event. Invitations to this event are extended to students, recent alumni, members of supervisory committees, and members of the Standing Review Committee. Although students are required to attend this event, overall participation has been poor, especially among faculty. Various formats have been tried in hopes of finding a venue that would be appealing to students, alumni and faculty and that would increase the number of attendees. These efforts have met with little success. In a recent past year, this event was cancelled due to lack of participation. Out of approximately 65 invitees, only 4 committed to attend.

Faculty Involvement

As shown in the data on supervisory committee membership (Sections IV, V, VI), participating faculty are drawn from many of the University's schools and colleges. The role of faculty in this Program is of overwhelming importance. The broadly interdisciplinary nature of the student's work coupled with the fact that students do not have a home department, make it imperative that the entire supervisory committee, not just the chair, work collectively to support the student's academic and professional development.

Some faculty have been particularly supportive of the IPhD program, referring students to it and enthusiastically participating in committees. Other faculty have agreed to serve on or chair IPhD committees but have not fully committed themselves to the Program or to the student. As a consequence of this uneven level of participation, students experience uneven levels of mentoring, financial support and logistical support from the members of their supervisory committees. Some committee chairs/members (and their home departments) have welcomed the students into the academic unit, providing them with a desk, mail box, access to financial support and the same level of mentoring they would offer to a departmental student. In other instances, the students have become "orphans" who have no locus within which to do their work and who have a difficult time engaging the attention of their committee.

Response to the 1993 Academic Program Review

The 1993 Review Committee Report contained numerous recommendations for improving the Program (see Section III). All of the recommendations have been addressed, plus additional efforts have been made to enhance the Program.

Challenges Facing the Program

1) Level of faculty participation

IPhD faculty have many responsibilities within their home departments and they face mounting demands on their time from many quarters. For some faculty, guiding and mentoring IPhD students has assumed a relatively low priority. The students are left to monitor their own progress and, more often than not, have suffered consequences. Requiring annual committee meetings and progress reports, providing students and faculty with a Program Handbook, making available dissertation fellowships, and inviting students and faculty to annual Program gatherings have done little to encourage faculty involvement. In some cases, the Program Coordinator must make numerous telephone calls and send multiple e-mails when soliciting students' annual progress reports, often with slow or no response from the faculty supervisors. In a couple of recent situations, new IPhD students have started their programs only to find that their chairs were on sabbatical for all or part of the year.

2) Quality and timeliness of students' programs

As noted in the Program statistics (see Section II, Table I), the time to degree has increased by almost 2 years since the last review. In addition, the time from candidacy to completion of degree has increased by over a year. This may be occurring because of the previously noted lack of faculty participation or because many of the students hold full or part time employment. No matter the reason, students are not progressing in a timely manner and the Standing Review Committee has had to issue numerous letters of probation over the past few years.

Another challenge arises from the fact that students are not adhering to the course of study outlined in the original application nor to the refined program of study as outlined in the <u>IPhD Supervisory Committee Meeting Report</u> (see Section VIII). In some instances, this is not the student's fault. Courses come and go and the students have complained that they have attempted to register for proposed coursework, only to find that a department no longer offers the course. In other instances, however, after gaining admission to the Program, students have completely abandoned the course of study and research topic that gained them entry into the Program.

3) Size and Quality of the Applicant Pool

The number of applicants to the Program has declined significantly in recent years (see Section II). There are several possible explanations. First, the Program does not actively advertise nor does it recruit (see Section III, #4). Second, many inquiries about the program come from persons who have done a web search for "interdisciplinary study". The Program Coordinator, Ms. Julia Carlson, encourages prospective applicants to first contact the UW PhD degree-offering units that may be involved in the individual's proposed program and to apply to this Program only if they can find no other alternative on campus. A third possible reason for the decline in numbers of applicants is the Program's rigorous screening process. Over the past few years, this Program has received a number of inquiries from individuals who are seeking a "flexible" PhD program – one that does not have

specified coursework and/or degree requirements. Such applicants are carefully screened and their applications are generally not accepted. The Program also frequently receives applications from students who have been denied admission to other UW programs. They, too, are unlikely to be admitted. Finally, applications that are incomplete on deadline day are not accepted.

While the foregoing may explain the decline in applications and enrollment, the important question for the review committee to consider is whether there is continuing need for the Program. Graduate programs at the University of Washington are increasingly interdisciplinary. The Graduate School itself administers 14 interdisciplinary degree and certificate programs. Examples include Molecular and Cellular Biology (MS, PhD), Near and Middle East Studies (PhD), Quantitative Ecology and Resource Management (MS, PhD), Global Trade and Transportation Logistics (graduate certificate). In aggregate, these programs enroll over 300 students. In addition, academic units are incorporating more and more interdisciplinary aspects into their programs and making it easier for students to assemble a supervisory committee whose members are drawn from diverse departments. There are also growing numbers of graduate certificate programs, interdisciplinary tracks within degree programs, and concurrent degree programs. Given these alternatives, it is possible that the needs previously met by the IPhD Program are being met elsewhere in the institution.

Charge to the Review Committee

Given the issues outlined above, the questions for the review committee to consider are: 1) Is there a continuing need for the Individual PhD Program? 2) Do faculty have sufficient time and resources to ensure that students will be able to graduate with a high quality IPhD? (3) If this Program is to continue, what steps can be taken to overcome the challenges that have been described?

II. Program Statistics

| - · · | Table I (Student Information) | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| | 1993 - Present | 1983 -1993 |
| # of new enrollees | -28 | 20 |
| # of applicants | 7 | Not available** |
| Total # of degrees granted | 22 | 33 |
| # of females graduated | 12 * * * | 17 |
| # of males graduated | 10 | 16 |
| # of minorities graduated | 4 | 10 |
| Average age of graduate | 40.7 | 37.7 |
| Average time to degree | 8.77 years | 6.86 years |
| Average # of quarters from achieving candidacy to degree | 14.3 | 9.3 |
| Average # of quarters on leave for Program graduates | 4.3 | 1.1 |
| Average # of quarters on leave for student that did not complete degree | 2.6 | 4.8 |
| # of students that did not complete prior to candidacy | 5 | 5 |
| # of students that did not complete after candidacy | 3 | 2 |

Table I (Student Information)

* # of applicants from 1996 – present; of this group, 9 admitted and 7 enrolled

Table II (Applicant Information)

| Admission Year | # of Applicants | # Admitted | # Enrolled |
|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| 1996 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 1997 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1998 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1999 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2001 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2002 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Statistics are not available because, unlike other UW degree-offering units, applicants were not required to submit a UW application until they were accepted into the Program.

III. Recommendations from 1993 review committee and Program's responses (in italics)

1. The Program is an important aspect of graduate education at a major university such as UW and should be continued

The Program has continued.

2. The Program should be used for Special and Individual PhD programs, each proposed initially by a student

Successful applicants continue to be unique and are not readily accommodated by other programs both within and outside the UW

3. The Program should be reviewed on the same decadal cycle as other PhD units

The last review for this Program was May 1993

4. The Program's size is appropriate for present demand, yet it should remain somewhat flexible depending on student interest (In addition, the Program should not be actively advertised nor should applicants be actively recruited by the Graduate School or by academic units)

The Graduate School does not actively advertise or recruit for the Program. Students are either referred (usually by UW faculty/staff) or have searched out the Program on the Web while looking for "interdisciplinary" programs. The Program continues to admit/deny applicants solely based on their applications.

- 5. Admission into the Program should remain rigorous See Section I, Description of Unit, Application Process
- 6. Annual review of each student's progress should be provided by their Graduate Committee and referred to the IPhD Review Committee for review The Program instituted a requirement that students convene annual committee meetings, submit annual progress papers, and annual Progress Reports. These are to be completed by the committee chairs and submitted to the Standing Review Committee.
- 7. The Program should take measures to encourage minority participation This recommendation was a difficult one to accomplish because of recommendation #4 – no active advertising or recruitment. The Program does, of course, adhere to the University's equal opportunity policies and the Program's materials affirm this.
- 8. The IPhD Standing Review Committee should have a formalized and continuing role in oversight of student admissions as well as student progress in the Program

The Standing Review Committee meets annually to review both applications and current students' progress. Members are provided with complete application materials, current students' progress reports, students' progress papers and the Program Coordinator's notes summarizing students' activities/personal development.

9. Mechanism should be made to integrate students with faculty and other students involved with the Program

Over the past years, the Program has sponsored an annual event for the students, faculty and recent alumni of the Program. A range of formats have been used, trying to find one that would best suit the Program and generate participation. In addition, the Program's Coordinator provides a casual breakfast meeting with the students early in Autumn Quarter to discuss their programs, concerns and the year's upcoming events.

10. Enhanced financial support should be allocated by the Graduate School specifically for students

The Graduate School provides a \$10,000 annual budget specifically for student use. The money has been used for the annual events and quarterly dissertation fellowship stipends.

11. Substantially more precise data should be maintained on student admissions, including denials, as well as student progress through and beyond the Program

The Standing Review Committee now completes an <u>Individual PhD Applicant</u> <u>Evaluation Form</u> which records the application, interview and overall rating of each applicant. Annual student progress reports are completed and placed in the student's file.

12. Minor reconfigurations of certain rules (see 1993 review)

All of the reconfigurations are now addressed in the Program's materials.

IV. Current Students

For each student, this section includes the following:

- Student's dissertation proposal (submitted with the application for admission)
- Student's resume
- Doctoral supervisory committee membership
- Student's current status information
- Supervisory committee chair's CV, including a list of doctoral committee appointments

| Name | Proposed Dissertation Title | Chair and Department | Entry Quarter and Year | Anticipated Graduation Date |
|------|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | The 'N' Word: Politics, Language, and Identity | Laada Bilaniuk, Anthropology | Autumn 2001 | June 2004 |
| | Reflective Function in Depressed Mothers | Susan Spieker, Family and Child Nursing | Autumn 2001 | September 2004 |

V. Graduates Since Last Review (1993-2002)

For each graduate, this section includes the following:

- Dissertation abstract
- Doctoral supervisory committee membership
- Graduate's final status information

| Racing immunities: How Yellow Fever gendered a nation | Susan Jeffords, English | 2000 | Not available |
|--|--|------|---|
| Light absorption by primary particles from fossil-fuel combustion: Implications for radiative forcing | Timothy Larson, Civil Engineering | 2000 | NOAA, Post-doc; University of Illinois, Assistant Professor |
| Chloride- cotransport modulation of synchronous epileptiform discharge | Philip Schwartzkroin, Neurological Surgery Mark Cooper, Zoology | 1999 | Duke Medical University, Assistant Professor |
| The free place: Literary, visual, and jazz creations of space in the 1960s | Johnnella Butler, American Ethnic Studies | 1999 | Amazon.com, Music Merchandising Manager |
| Engaging community in the technical design process: An analysis of the development of the Seattle Public Schools' budget builder World Wide Website | Andrew Gordon, Public Affairs | 1998 | Self employed, consultant in social design consulting field |
| Genetic testing for susceptibility to breast and ovarian cancer: A case study of clinical decision- making in medical genetics | Albert R. Jonsen, Medical History & Ethics | 1997 | University of California, San Francisco, Internal Medicine, 3 rd year resident |

| Racing immunities: How Yellow Fever gendered a nation | Susan Jeffords, English | 2000 | Not available |
|--|--|------|---|
| Light absorption by primary particles from fossil-fuel combustion: Implications for radiative forcing | Timothy Larson, Civil Engineering | 2000 | NOAA, Post-doc; University of Illinois |
| Chloride- cotransport modulation of synchronous epileptiform discharge | Philip Schwartzkroin, Neurological Surgery Mark Cooper, Zoology | 1999 | Duke Medical University, Assistant Professor |
| The free place: Literary, visual, and jazz creations of space in the 1960s | Johnnella Butler, American Ethnic Studies | 1999 | Amazon.com, Music Merchandising Manager |
| Engaging community in the technical design process: An analysis of the development of the Seattle Public Schools' budget builder World Wide Website | Andrew Gordon, Public Affairs | 1998 | Self employed, consultant in social design consulting field |
| Genetic testing for susceptibility to breast and ovarian cancer: A case study of clinical decision- making in medical genetics | Albert R. Jonsen, Medical History & Ethics | 1997 | University of California, San Francisco, Internal Medicine, 3 rd year resident |

| Quantifying the uncertainties in measurements of aerosol optical properties relevant to the direct shortwave forcing of climate | Robert J. Charlson, Atmospheric Sciences | 1996 | University of Washington, Research Associate in Department of Chemical Engineering |
|---|--|------|---|
| Mediating representations and constructivist knowledge acquisition | Earl Hunt, Psychology | 1996 | University of Western Florida, Institute of Human and Machine Cognition |
| Sustainable development in one Amazon varzea | Robert G. Lee, Forest Resources | 1995 | Washington Utilities and Transportation Committee |
| Molecular mechanisms of block of sodium channels by inactivation gate peptides | William A. Catterall, Graduate Program in Neurobiology | 1995 | University of Washington, Post- doctoral research fellow in Department of Physiology and Biophysics |
| A theory of animate perception | David K. Farkas, Technical Communication | 1995 | Intrawest (major developer & operator of leisure time properties), Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer |
| Public policy impacts on organizational behavior: A case study program evaluation – transportation demand management in Washington State | Cyrus G. Ulberg, Public Affairs | 1994 | Kean University, College of Business and Public Administration, Senior Associate Professor |

÷. •

| The effect of cultural assimilator training on cross- cultural bargaining outcomes | Ralph Johnson, Law | 1994 | Not available |
|--|---------------------------------|------|--|
| The general riot of the natural forest: Landscape change in the Blue Mountains | Sievert Rohwer, Zoology | 1994 | University of Wisconsin- Madison, Institute for Environmental Studies & Dept. of Forest Ecology & Mgmt, Associate Professor (tenured) |
| Behavioral and biochemical mechanisms of olfactory imprinting and homing by Coho salmon | Thomas P. Quinn, Fisheries | 1994 | National Marine Fisheries Service |
| Generalization of social skills training with traumatically brain-injured patients | Felix Billingsley, Education | 1993 | NeuroCare of Washington |

VI. Students Who Did Not Complete Their Programs

For each of these students, this section includes the following:

- Doctoral supervisory committee membership
- Student's final status information

| Name | Program Entry Quarter and Year | Last Quarter and Year in Program | Reason for Leaving |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Spring 2000 | Spring 2001 | Finances and family obligations (International student from Australia) |
| · · · | Autumn 1995 | Spring 2001 | Demanding position as Asst. Dean at Lewis & Clark College, Oregon; difficulty with supervisory committee |
| - | Autumn 1997 | Winter 2000 | Dropped from Program for unsatisfactory progress |
| | Autumn 1993 | Winter 1999 | Finances and moved out of state |
| | Autumn 1995 | Spring 1997 | Transferred to new department (Pharmacy) |
| | Autumn 1992 | Spring 1997 | Priorities changed |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Autumn 1993 | Autumn 1995 | Not available |
| • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | Autumn 1990 | Autumn 1995 | Not available |
| | Autumn 1993 | Spring 1994 | Priorities changed |

VII. Standing Review Committee Membership

Current Committee

| Name | Department | Appointment Date | |
|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| William George | Psychology | 1999 | |
| Philip Green | Genome Sciences | 2001 | |
| Judy Howard | Sociology/Women Studies | 1994 | |
| Lynn Thomas | History | 2001 | |

.

Past Members

| Name | Department | Appointment Ending Date | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Kathryn Barnard | Nursing | 1994 | |
| Edward Bassett | Communication | 1997 | |
| James Bassingthwaighte | Bioengineering | 1998 | |
| Diana Behler | Germanics | 1999 | |
| Roger del Moral | Botany | 2000 | |
| Albert Gordon | Physiology and Biophysics | 1999 | |
| Douglas Ramsay | Pediatric Dentistry | 1999 | |
| Sven Rossel | Comparative Literature | 1994 | |
| Edgar Winans | Anthropology | 1994 | |

VIII. Program Materials

This section includes the following:

- General Description •
- Application Materials
- Annual Progress Report
 Committee Meeting Report
 Program Manual



Interdisciplinary Programs

Individual Ph.D. (IPhD) Program

Please Note: This Program is scheduled for a program review Autumn Quarter 2002, and admission to the Program may be suspended effective Autumn Quarter 2003.

About the Program

The Graduate School maintains a Ph.D. degree granting unit, the Individual Ph.D. (IPhD) Program, for exceptionally able students in high academic standing whose objectives for study are so truly interdisciplinary that they cannot be met within one of the University units authorized to grant the Ph.D. degree. The Program is intended for dissertation topics which require supervision from two or more of the programs through which the University offers the Ph.D. degree. Each of these individual programs is designed by a student with a considerable amount of input and continued guidance from the student's supervisory committee. This Program is managed by an IPhD Program Coordinator and headed by the Dean of the Graduate School.

The IPhD Program is not intended to be:

- a mechanism for offering the Ph.D. degree within units which do not have their own authorized Ph.D. programs;
- used as an alternative for students unable to gain admission to an established program AND;
- placing faculty from more than one department on a supervisory committee is a standard procedure and alone is not sufficient justification for admission into the Program.

Because the University's primary commitment is to its <u>established</u> disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, the IPhD Program is quite small. Unusual student ability and motivation, as well as an increased level of attention from the entire supervisory committee, are required for the successful completion of an IPhD degree. Admission standards are therefore intended to exceed those of established Ph.D. programs, and applications are carefully reviewed at several levels.

Like most doctoral programs, applications are considered only once a year. Due to the stringent entrance requirements, many applicants are not admitted. All decisions are final with no appeal procedures available. An application which is rejected can be submitted in revised form another year though a second rejection is possible. Applicants are therefore encouraged to pursue their objectives within the University's established Ph.D. programs whenever feasible.

Return to the Top

When to initiate a Program

An applicant may apply to the IPhD Program when he/she has completed a master's degree, or has been admitted to the Graduate School and completed at least three quarters of full-time work at the University of Washington. If an applicant is not currently a graduate student at the University of Washington, he/she must submit an application to the Graduate School with the appropriate fee.

w to initiate a Program

applicant should begin by contacting the Graduate Program Coordinator (faculty advisor) of each program potentially involved ... ne IPhD application to determine whether the proposed course of study is appropriate for the IPhD Program as opposed to an established UW program. The applicant should then approach a Graduate Faculty member who is qualified to provide appropriate guidance. If the faculty member agrees that the program is feasible and desirable and agrees to serve as the student's principal dissertation advisor, the applicant may propose a supervisory committee with the faculty member as Chair. This proposed committee will include at least three but usually not more than five members of the Graduate Faculty representing

applicant's fields of interest. It must include Graduate Faculty members from at least two University units which offer the

...D. degree. At any one time, a faculty member may serve as Chair on only one IPhD Supervisory Committee and on no more man two as a member. For additional information regarding supervisory committees, refer to <u>Graduate School Memorandum</u> No. 13 or the UW General Catalog.

How to Apply

An applicant must schedule an interview with the IPhD Program Coordinator and submit the IPhD Application form including all required documents. Complete applications are due by **December 15th** of each year for admission to the Program the following Autumn quarter. Applications submitted after this date will not be considered.

IPhD Application form

IPhD Application Requirements

Return to the Top

How the application is reviewed

The Graduate School will request evaluations of the application from Graduate Program Coordinators in related units and from other members of the Graduate Faculty selected for their expertise. A Standing Review Committee will consider the application and the faculty evaluations, conduct an interview with the applicant, and make a recommendation as to whether the applicant should be admitted to the IPhD Program. Decisions on admission are made by May 31st of the year following application and the applicant is notified, by mail, within two weeks.

Accepted into the Program

If the IPhD application is approved, the Dean will appoint the student's Supervisory Committee, which ordinarily will include the obers of the proposed Committee plus an additional member of the Graduate Faculty to serve as a Graduate School presentative. The Supervisory Committee will function as for any doctoral program, will sign the forms ordinarily transmitted by the sponsoring academic unit and will take responsibility for conducting an annual review of the student's progress and submitting a report to the Standing Review Committee. IPhD students must meet all program requirements as stipulated in the IPhD Program Manual and Graduate School doctoral requirements as stipulated in the current UW General Catalog.

IPhD Graduates

The IPhD Program graduated its first student in 1970. Since then, over 100 students have received an IPhD degree. A list of IPhD Graduates, dissertation titles and supervisory committees chairs is available upon request.

Questions regarding the IPhD Program may be directed to the IPhD Program Coordinator at 543-8720 or <u>studentservices@grad.washington.edu</u>.

The University of Washington reaffirms its policy of equal opportunity regardless of race, color creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, disability, or status as a disabled veteran or Vietnam era veteran in accordance with University policy and applicable federal and state statutes and regulations.

The University of Washington is committed to providing access, equal opportunity and reasonable accommodation in its services, programs, activities, education and employment for individuals with disabilities. To request disability accommodation in the application process contact the department at (206)543-8720 or the Disability Services Office at least ten days in advance at (206)543-6450/V, (206)543-6452/TTY, (206)685-3885 (FAX), or access@u.washington.edu. To receive information or additional disability accommodations contact: Disabled Student Services at (206)543-8924/V, (206)543-8925/TTY, (206)616-8379 (FAX) or uwdss@u.washington.edu.

Return to the Top

| ing Graduate School Modified: 08/28/02 | Office of Academic Programs | acadprog@grad.washington.edu | Telephone: 206-685-3519 |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Moumeu. 06/26/02 | | | |

The Individual Ph.D. Program has demanding application requirements and a strict deadline. The following original documents and 10 copies of each must be provided by the stated deadline in support of an Individual Ph.D. proposal:

- 1. A completed Individual Ph.D. Program Application
- 2. Statement of purpose which indicates the scope and objectives of the proposed program of study and research, its theoretical significance and/or practical importance; justification of the program's interdisciplinary nature; and substantiation that the University has the necessary resources to support such a program.
- 3. A detailed description of the dissertation plan (approximately 6 pages/maximum of 10 pages).
- 4. A proposed program of study which lists by field the actual coursework completed and those courses still to be completed, and includes comments on the nature and relevance of preparatory work already completed and in progress.
- 5. A tentative schedule for completing these activities.
- 6. One copy of transcripts from colleges or universities attended.
- 7. Statement indicating to which other University programs the student has applied and the results of the applications.
- Education Testing Service record of Verbal, Quantitative and Analytical Graduate Record Examination scores (scores submitted should not be older than 10 years).
- 9. A bio-sketch from the Chair of the proposed Supervisory Committee, including previous experience in supervising Ph.D. students.
- 10. Letters of evaluation* from each member of the proposed Supervisory Committee, specifying in detail how each member will participate in guiding the student's program. The letter from the Chair should also include what forms of basic graduate support will be made available to the student such as office or lab space, computer availability, teaching or funding opportunities. These letters should be mailed directly to the IPhD Program Coordinator at: IPhD Program, The Graduate School, University of Washington, G-1 Communications, Box 353770, Seattle, Washington 98195.
- 11. Resume

12. A maximum of 2 letters of personal recommendation is accepted but not required*.

Application Due Date:December 15th of the current year(Applications submitted after this date will not be considered)Decision Due Date:May 31st of the following year

*Letters of evaluation and recommendation may be submitted through the first Friday of Winter Quarter following the application due

INDIVIDUAL PH.D. (IPhD) PROGRAM APPLICATION

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON – The Graduate School

| . oplicant Name: | | | | C. | UW Student #: | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| E-mail Address: | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | Telephone #: | |
| Mailing Address: | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| · _ | | | | | | • |
| Present academic unit: | | | | | | |
| Last quarter at UW: | • | | | | | . |
| Previous Degrees: | Degree | <u>Field</u> | University | | Year Awarded | |
| | ···· | · · | | . · | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Proposed Field of Study: | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| Tentative Dissertation Title: | | | | | | |

Proposed Supervisory Committee Statement

nd that this proposed Individual Ph.D. Program is (1) a well-considered program not now provided for within the academic authorized to offer a Ph.D. program at the University and is adequate preparation for the Ph.D. degree; (2) that the existing library, laboratory and research facilities are adequate for this special program; and (3) that the applicant is qualified to attempt the program.

We are willing to serve as a Supervisory Committee for the applicant's program and, if the application is approved, we accept the responsibility of conducting an annual review of the student's progress to be submitted to the Standing Review Committee ir addition to ensuring that coursework, research requirements and the General and Final Exams are completed in a timely manner.

| | <u>Name</u> | Department | Signature | Date |
|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|------|
| Chair: | | | | |
| Members: | | | | |
| | | × | | |
| | | | | |
| | · | ······ | | |
| | | | | |

Please indicate members of the Graduate Faculty with an asterisk (*)

All the above information is complete and accurate and I have submitted an original proposal along with 10 copies of this application and 10 copies of the proposal by the deadline of December 15th.

Applicant Signature

University of Washington – Graduate School Individual Ph.D. Applicant Evaluation Form

Applicant:

After reviewing the attached application, please complete the application rating part of this form prior to the IPhD Review Committee Annual Meeting.

Application Rating: (Check one, giving details under "Comments")

Very likely to be accepted - program is appropriate and student seems qualified.

- Probably should be accepted some program modifications and/or strengthening of student qualifications are needed.
- Probably should not be accepted substantial program modifications and/or strengthening of student qualifications are needed.

Very unlikely to be accepted - program is inappropriate and/or student does not seem qualified.

Comments:

Interview comments:

Overall Rating: (Check one)

_____ Applicant should be accepted.

Applicant should probably be accepted if discussed program modifications and/or strengthening of student qualifications are met by a specified date.

_____ Applicant should not be accepted.

Evaluator signature

Please bring this form with the proposal to the Review Committee meeting.

<u>Individual Ph.D.</u> 2001 – 2002 Progress Report

| Student: «FirstName» «LastName» | Student #: <u>«Student_»</u> | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Field of Study: | IPhD Entry Date: <u>«Entry_Date»</u> | |
| Chair: «Chairperson» | Department: «Department» | |
| Currently enrolled: <u>«Currently_enrolled»</u> | Currently On-Leave: <u>«OnLeave»</u> | |
| On-Leave Dates: <u>«OnLeave_Dates»</u> | | |
| Quarter General Exam completed: <u>«General_Exam»</u> | | |
| Number of dissertation credits completed: «Dissertati | on_credits» | |
| Please complete the following: | | <u></u> |
| 1. Has the student completed all required coursework? | Yes 🗆 No | |
| Has the student met all foreign language requireme If not applicable, please check □ | nts? 🗆 Yes 🗆 No | |
| Has the supervisory committee met with the student past year? If yes, how many times has the committee | | |
| 4. What is the student's anticipated graduation date? | | |
| 5. Is the student making satisfactory progress? | 🗆 Yes 🗆 No | |

Please provide a brief, typewritten summary of the student's progress towards the Ph.D. degree during the 2001 –2002 academic year, including a statement describing his/her academic goals for the next year.

Signature

Please return this form to the IPhD Coordinator, Box 353770, by Monday, April 22nd.

IPhD Supervisory Committee Meeting Report

| Student Name: | |
|--|--|
| Please list the coursework that must be completed prior to | |
| | o the General Exam: |
| Department Course Number & Title | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| · | |
| | |
| | |
| Does the student have a language requirement(s)? | Yes D No D |
| If yes, what language requirement(s) must be met? | |
| | |
| | |
| Please describe the formats to be used for any preliminary | exams and for the General Exam: |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Proposed dissertation title: | · |
| | |
| Tentative dates for completion of exams: General | Final |
| After reviewing the student's initial proposal, we held a comm the above-listed requirements. | nittee meeting with the student and have agreed to |
| Supervisory Committee Names (Printed) | Signatures |
| | Signatures |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Send of the send o | |
| Student signature | Date |
| · · · · | |
| Graduate School Dean's Approval | Date |

IX. Appendices

This section includes the following:

- Appendix A Graduate Student Statistical Summary (Complete applicant statistics are not available because, unlike other UW degree-offering units, applicants were not required to submit a UW application until they were accepted into the IPhD Program)
- Appendix B Hec Board Summary

| Graduate Student Statistic Individual Ph.D. Program | | - | | | | - | g | | i: 31-Oct- | 01 |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|------------------|------------|----------|------------|---------|
| R Autumn Quarter Enrollment | 1992 <i>-</i> 93 | 1993-94 | 1994-95 | 1995-96 | 1996-97 | 1997 <i>-</i> 98 | 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 |
| Enrollment History | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tota! | 10 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| Full-Time | 6 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Part-Time | 4 | 1 | 3 | . 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Male | 4 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| Female | 6 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Ethnic Minority | 1 | , 3 | 2 | 2 | 9, 3 | | | 5 | - | 3 |
| International | 1 | · 1 | 2 | | 0 | 2 | 1 | | 0 | 0 |
| Wash, Resident | 9 | 13 | | 1 | - | 0 | • | | 1 | 0 |
| Non-Resident | | | 13 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 |
| New Student Enrollment | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 2 |
| Continuing | 7 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Annual Application (Sum-Spr qt | rs) 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Autumn Quarter Application | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 2 |
| Autumn Quarter Denials | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 |
| Autumn Quarter Offers | 1 | 4 | 1. | 3 | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 2 |
| Autumn Quarter Percentages | | | | . – | , | - | | | v | 2 |
| % Denied (of Applications) | 50.0% | 0.0% | 66.7% | 25.0% | 50.0% | | 100.0% | | | 0.0% |
| % Offers (of Applications) | 50.0% | 80.0% | 33.3% | 75.0% | 50.0% | | | | | |
| % New Enrollees (of Apps) | 50.0% | 60.0% | 33.3% | 75.0% | 0.0% | | | | | 100.0% |
| % New Enrollees (of Offers) | 100.0% | 75.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | | | | | 100.0% |
| Autumn Minority Admissions | | | | | 0.078 | | | | | 100.0% |
| Applications | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | ~ | • |
| Denials | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | • 0 | 0 |
| Offers | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Autumn International Admissions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applications | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Denials | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Offers | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Applicant Average GPA | | | | | | | | | Ŭ | U |
| Denied | 3.40 | | 3.63 | | 3.98 | | | | | |
| Accepted But Not Enrolled | | 3.43 | | | 3.71 | | | | | 3.93 |
| Accepted and Enrolled | 3.70 | 3.03 | 3.98 | 3.75 | | | | | | |
| Applicant Average GRE Scores | | | | 3.79 | | | | | | 3.93 |
| Denied | | | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal Score | 640 | | 510 | 620 | | | 600 | | | |
| Quantitative Score | 470 | | 430 | | | | 690 700 | | | |
| Analytical Score | 620 | | | 620 660 | | | 780 | | | |
| Accepted But Not Enrolled | 020 | | 330 | 660 | | | 710 | | | |
| Verbal Score | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 760 | | | | | 665 |
| Quantitative Score | | | | | 710 | | | | | 665 |
| Analytical Scor | | | | | 720 | | | | | 660 |
| Accepted and Enrolled | | | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal Score | 800 | 595 | 720 | 690 | | | | | | 665 |
| Quantitative Score | 640 | 555 | 540 | 650 | | | | | | 665 |
| Analytical Score | 750 | 555 | 530 | 695 | | | | | | 660 |
| nnual Degrees Awarded (Sum-S | pr qtrs) | | | | | | | | | |
| Masters: | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Doctoral: | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |
| Ph.D. Candidates: | | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | |
| utumn Quarter Financial Suppor | t | | | | | | | - | • | |
| Teaching Assistants | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 1 | |
| Research Assistants | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | <u>ل</u> | I | |
| Fellowships | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | |
| Traineeships | | - | | - | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | | |

-

,

| Interdisciplinary Graduate | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| R Automa Overstee Erectlement | 1992-93 | 1993-94 | 1994-95 | 1995-96 | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998- 9 9 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 |
| Autumn Quarter Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enrollment History | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 226 | 269 | 301 | 293 | 336 | 333 | 380 | 363 | 382 | 398 |
| Full-Time | 178 | 209 | 233 | 235 | 276 | 288 | 311 | 305 | 330 | 347 |
| Part-Time | 48 | 60 | 68 | 58 | 60 | 45 | 69 | 58 | 52 | 51 |
| Male | 89 | 121 | 142 | 137 | 147 | 153 | 187 | 170 | | |
| Female | 137 | 148 | 159 | 156 | 189 | 180 | 193 | 193 | 173 | 176 |
| Ethnic Minority | 25 | 36 | 49 | 42 | 44 | | | | 209 | 222 |
| International | 56 | 81 | 49 80 | 42 80 | 44 91 | 45 | 55 | 45 | 45 | 47 |
| Wash, Resident | | | | | | 79 | 99 | 95 | 119 | 122 |
| | 121 | 141 . | 142 | 149 | 158 | 178 | 206 | 202 | 205 | 216 |
| Non-Resident | 105 | 128 | 159 | 144 | 178 | 155 | 174 | 161 | 177 | 182 |
| New Student Enrollment | 117 | 127 | 151 | 125 | 151 | 135 | 164 | 154 | 165 | 176 |
| Continuing | 107 | 134 | 145 | 161 | 180 | 192 | 212 | 203 | 210 | 216 |
| Annual Application (Sum-Spr qt | / | 766 | ŕ 7 75 | 793 | 843 | 901 | 980 | 881 | 804 | |
| Autumn Quarter Applications | 617 | 684 | 699 | 721 | 763 | 813 | 897 | 795 | 719 | 710 |
| Autumn Quarter Denials | 378 | 465 | 455 | 485 | 473 | 524 | 601 | 390 | 400 | 348 |
| Autumn Quarter Offers | 176 | 167 | 191 | 165 | 219 | 221 | 264 | 285 | 270 | 317 |
| Autumn Quarter Percentages | | | | | | | | | - | |
| % Denied (of Applications) | 61.3% | 68.0% | 65.1% | 67.3% | 62.0% | 64.5% | 67.0% | 49.1% | 55.6% | 49.0% |
| % Offers (of Applications) | 28.5% | .24.4% | 27.3% | 22.9% | 28.7% | 27.2% | 29.4% | 35.8% | 37.6% | 44.6% |
| % New Enrollees (of Apps) | 19.0% | 18.6% | 21.6% | 17.3% | 19.8% | 16.6% | 18.3% | 19.4% | 22.9% | 24.8% |
| % New Enrollees (of Offers) | 66.5% ⁻ | 76.0% | 79.1% | 75.8% | 68.9% | 61.1% | 62.1% | 54.0% | 61.1% | 24.8% 55.5% |
| Autumn Minority Admissions | | | | | | - | | | | 55.578 |
| Applications | 65 | 93 | 106 | 100 | 108 | 108 | 147 | 110 | 110 | 88 |
| Denials | 37 | 57 | 72 | 71 | 67 | 66 | 109 | 56 | 74 | 44 |
| Offers | 21 | 27 | 23 | 15 | 28 | 30 | 37 | 35 | | |
| Autumn International Admissions | | | | .5 | 20 | 50 | 57 | 55 | 32 | 40 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applications Desigle | 159 | 172 | 168 | 162 | 209 | 221 | 226 | 210 | 232 | 240 |
| Denials | 89 | 95 | 97 | 86 | 115 | 147 | 123 | 90 | 107 | 109 |
| Offers | 49 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 80 | 64 | 92 | 95 | 100 | 108 |
| Applicant Average GPA | 3.31 | 3 44 | 2 22 | 2 4 4 | 2.04 | 0.40 | | | | |
| Denied | | 3.41 | 3.32 | 3.41 | 3.31 | 3.40 | 3.37 | 3.38 | 3.43 | 3.38 |
| Accepted But Not Enrolled | 3.60 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.56 | 3.61 | 3.65 | 3.55 | 3.55 | 3.58 | 3.50 |
| Accepted and Enrolled | 3.38 | 3.41 | 3.40 | 3.33 | 3.53 | 3.58 | 3.51 | 3.53 | 3.54 | 3.50 |
| Applicant Average GRE Scores | | | | | | | | | | |
| Denied | | | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal Score | 552 | 556 | 545 | 563 | 545 | 541 | 548 | 545 | 532 | 522 |
| Quantitative Score | 663 | 660 | 651 | 656 | 658 | 647 | 648 | 656 | 673 | 663 |
| Analytical Score | 627 | 638 | 634 | 649 | 645 | 640 | 631 | 643 | 656 | 651 |
| Accepted But Not Enrolled | | | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal Score | 617 | 629 | 612 | 596 | 627 | 592 | 594 | 599 | 570 | 583 |
| Quantitative Score | 697 | 686 | 691 | 646 | 705 | 681 | 677 | 681 | 678 | 690 |
| Analytical Score | 682 | 695 | 686 | 644 | 703 | 667 | 667 | 679 | 685 | 691 |
| Accepted and Enrolled | | | | | | | _ * | | | |
| Verbal Score | 549 | 548 | 612 | 579 | 561 | 562 | 557 | 583 | 525 | 574 |
| Quantitative Score | 609 | 613 | 636 | 643 | 648 | 652 | 652 | | 535 | 571 |
| Analytical Score | 595 | 592 | 640 | 659 | 648 648 | 636 | 638 | 648 643 | 620 643 | 658 650 |
| nnual Degrees Awarded (Sum-S | | | - • • | | 040 | 550 | 020 | 643 | 643 | 660 |
| Masters: | 32 | 34 | 40 | 46 | 46 | 54 | | 50 | | |
| | | ** | 40 | | | 34 | 44 | 59 | 49 | |
| Doctoral: | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 6 | 18 | 28 | 33 | |
| Ph.D. Candidates: | | | 15 | 23 | 29 | 28 | 26 | | 20 | |
| Autumn Quarter Financial Suppo | rt | | 15 | é. | 23 | 20 | 28 | 33 | 32 | |
| Teaching Assistants | 12 | 13 | 27 | 19 | 25 | 26 | 25 | | • 6 | |
| Research Assistants | 54 | 60 | 81 | 71 | | 26 | 35 | 29 | 28 | |
| Fellowships | 34 10 | 13 | 18 | | 95 27 | 107. | 123 | 115 | 108 | |
| | 10 | 10 | 10 | 23 | 27 | 35 | 32 | 30 | 38 | |

Η.

| | 2002-2001 | 2001-2000 | 2000-1999 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of doctoral degrees granted in each of the last three years | 3 | 1 | 4 |

I. Plans to improve the quality and effectiveness of the program and overall goals:

The Program is asking the review committee to address whether or not there is a need for this Program's existence. Should the committee recommend the Program remain in existence, we hope counsel will be offered on ways to strengthen the applicant pool and to ensure that those enrolled will be well mentored and will have a high quality degree program.

Appendix B – Hec Board Summary

- A. Name of unit authorized to offer degrees: Individual PhD Program
- B. College: The Graduate School
- C. Exact title of degree offered: Individual PhD
- D. Year of last review: 1993

E. Brief description of the field and its history at the UW:

The IPhD Program is a PhD degree-offering unit administered by the Graduate School. The Program is directed by the Dean of the Graduate School, managed by a Coordinator (approximately 10 -15% of a full time workload) and reviewed annually by a Standing Review Committee (see Section VII) comprised of faculty from a variety of disciplines. The Program was created over 30 years ago with the first degree granted in 1970. A total of 112 degrees have been granted to date.

The Program's primary role is to offer opportunities for exceptionally able students in high academic standing to achieve a PhD in areas of study where other UW PhD degree-offering units cannot accommodate the students due to the highly interdisciplinary nature of their programs. This special program allows students to integrate coursework and recruit supervisory committee members from two or more UW PhD degree-offering units so as to form a program of study without having to satisfy each academic unit's individual requirements. Though there are a number of Canadian universities that offer similar programs (the closest being the University of British Columbia), the IPhD is unique both within the UW and nationally.

F. Documentation of continuing need for your program:

There is a question as to whether or not this Program's usefulness has been met and whether the Program should be eliminated. The reviewers of this self-study have been asked to determine whether there is a continuing need for this Program.

G. Assessment information relating to student learning outcomes and program effectiveness:

The Program's Standing Review Committee meets annually to review current students' progress and evaluate the Program's overall quality and effectiveness, implementing policy changes if necessary. Because the Program graduates only a few students per year, Graduate School Exit Questionnaire summaries are not available for departmental review.