Overview

Academic Program Review is one of the most consequential, complex, and costly Senate activities. Well executed reviews of academic programs contribute meaningfully to the academic planning and budget decisions that shape the future of the campus. In the practice of shared governance, the Academic Senate controls the review process but works closely with the Provost and the respective Dean to provide the Administration with the necessary data, analysis, and recommendations. Thus to aid the work of departmental, school, and central campus administration and to further the academic plan of the units concerned, the Academic Program Review process must be performed as efficiently, transparently, and fairly as feasible.

The 2013-14 Special Committee to Review the Academic Program Review Process, formed to evaluate the effectiveness of the current processes and recommend modifications, was chaired by Division Chair Peter Krapp, and included Carol Booth Olson as immediate past chair of the APRB, Scott Rychnowsky as a past APRB member, Carol Burke as Vice Chair of Graduate Council, Council on Educational Policy chair Tony Smith, ICS Dean Hal Stern, Penny Portillo as Assistant Dean of Humanities, and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Planning Michael Clark. It was staffed by Jill Kato, Graduate Council and APRB analyst, and by Senate Executive Director Luisa Crespo. The Special Committee also met twice with Assistant Vice Chancellor Ryan Cherland of the Office of Institutional Research.

Although the recommendations are minor, here is an executive summary: Considering the Regental Standing Orders and the University’s Bylaws, committee members recommend keeping the program review process in the Academic Senate. Data required for each review should be selected carefully so as not to overwhelm the process; the Office of Institutional Research has new capacity that will support this targeted selection. The Senate staff should be more involved in preparing the logistics of the visit, while the APRB members should focus more on review quality and proper process rather than on preparations. Committee members agree that external reviewers need more guidance, both for the visit and for the written report. The selection of external reviewers remains a crucial factor for the quality of academic reviews, and clear and consistent templates will be important to maintain continuity in academic reviews. Senate staff should not only provide a well-defined review template but also offer continuous guidance throughout the process of writing and editing reviews, so as to avoid errors of omission or commission. The latter category includes, but is not limited to, reproduction of gossip or other unverifiable information; reviewers should be advised that the report is a semi-public document, and that any noteworthy inside information they wish to have the Senate and Administration consider (despite its confidential or unverifiable character) can be put into a confidential addendum to the report. The timeframe of the visits themselves is acceptable and should be kept as currently handled. However, the committee agrees that the full timeframe from initiating a review to concluding the discussion of the report can be streamlined. In particular, the respective Dean and the Provost’s office should see external reports before the very end of the process, marked as draft if appropriate. This will help ensure that the campus ties the results of program reviews to strategic planning in the units and campus-wide. Last but not least, this document describing the Academic Review Program process should be made available to all Deans before each respective review begins.
History and Continuity

The last time an Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the academic program review description and procedures (in 2005), it looked back at the previous report on the state of the joint review process (1999), and the same is the case this time around. As before, the process is understood to work well enough that it needs to be optimized and updated rather than completely revamped. Prior to 1999, academic program reviews were carried out by Graduate Council and Council on Educational Policy, but usually not jointly. An Ad Hoc Committee on Joint Reviews was charged by the UC Irvine Academic Senate in December 1999, and after consultations the process was finalized in June 1999. Some UC campuses still review graduate and undergraduate programs separately, as was the practice at UC Irvine until 1999. Other campuses review the graduate and undergraduate programs of a given academic unit together. The 1999 Committee’s charge was to propose a procedure under which the graduate and undergraduate programs of a given UCI academic unit will be reviewed simultaneously (a joint academic program review).

Several of the questions before the current review of the review were already pivotal in 1999 – for instance, the honoraria for external reviewers, improving the data collected and used in the review process, and the confidentiality and disposition of review documents. The first joint review under the new rules starting 1999 was of the School of Biological Sciences. Annually since then, the Senate has been carrying out its duty to conduct academic reviews of any units with curricular programs. Bylaw changes in 2005-2006 further defined the Academic Program Review subcommittee, and as of 2007, the chair of the board no longer has to be a concurrent member of either CEP or GC. The Chair is appointed for a three-year term by the Committee on Committees, and is required to have prior experience on either the CEP or GC, with strong preference given to Division members with prior experience conducting program reviews.

In proposing certain minor modifications, this document will incorporate the standard procedures recommended by the Senate’s 1999 Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews (hereafter called the 1999 Report), as modified by the 2005 Joint Review of Academic Programs (hereafter called the 2005 Report). After the 2005 Report, the Senate conducted eight reviews under the recommended joint undergraduate-graduate review process. The present document will reflect the combined experience of the past several review cycles and the 2014 Committee’s subsequent deliberations on the review process.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) made program reviews the central focus of their accreditation process, and requires an element of self-study from universities. UC Irvine performs well beyond the WASC standards for academic program reviews, and received explicit praise in the last WASC review for the local process – see pages 18-21 and 36-41 of the 2012 WASC Educational Effectiveness Report, available online in full at http://www.accreditation.uci.edu/effectiveness.html. One area for improvement is demonstration of how academic program reviews are used in the decision making process on campus. At UC Irvine, the Academic Planning Group (APG), a high-level joint Senate-Administrative body advising the Provost on academic resource allocation and strategic emphases, has been using the completed APRB reports in its recommendations. UC Irvine may want to demonstrate other systematic reference to APRB reviews in its administrative processes. UC Irvine’s Preparatory Self-Study for the latest WASC review pointed out that UC Irvine was about “implement the revised academic program review process and conduct a self-study to assess the effect of the revisions”, which is one aim of the current document as it summarizes the efforts of the 2013-14 Special Committee to Review the Academic Program Review Process.
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I. ACADEMIC SENATE RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO PROGRAM REVIEWS

A. Mandate for Academic Program Reviews
Periodic review of academic programs is an established practice throughout the University of California. While each campus appears to have developed its own practices, at UC Irvine the reviews have been firmly under the control of the local Academic Senate Division, which reports its findings to various administrative officers, and we intend to maintain this practice.

B. Allocation of Responsibility for Reviews
Divisional Bylaw 85 specifically charges the Council on Educational Policy (CEP) "to review and report on the character of the educational programs on the Irvine campus." Divisional Bylaw 100 by reference to Senate Bylaw 330 charges the Graduate Council (GC) to "regulate ... the graduate work of the Division ... through its regular reviews of current graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness". Divisional Bylaw 120 establishing the Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries (CORCL) does not refer to any responsibilities for program review, but CORCL does routinely conduct reviews of Organized Research Units at UCI.

II. MANAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. Academic Program Review Board (APRB)
1. Description
Faculty supervision of the review process is by a standing joint subcommittee of the CEP and GC, called the Academic Program Review Board (APRB). The Chair of this Joint Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a three-year term and report regularly to the Chairs of CEP and GC, attending those meetings as appropriate. In recognition of the level of responsibility associated with this post, the APRB Chair will receive Senate Compensation.

In addition to the Chair, the APRB has four Senate faculty members, two each from among the membership of their respective councils. The subcommittee members will have staggered two year terms such that half the subcommittee each year has experience from the previous year.

The Vice Provost for Academic Planning and the Office of Institutional Research will work closely with the APRB, providing opportunity for direct input from and communication with the Administration.

2. Duties
The function of the APRB is to carry out the review process as outlined in Section IV. The APRB is charged with producing the reviews and delivering the reviews to the CEP, GC, and Provost in a timely and efficient manner. It is the responsibility of the latter agencies, not the APRB, to evaluate and act on the reviews in a manner consistent with their respective responsibilities for academic program review.

Following is a list of specific duties, which should adhere to the review process described in Section IV. Tasks should be delegated in such a way that APRB members are not required to work on the review of their own unit.
• Meet at the beginning of each review cycle for planning purposes, and throughout the year, as deemed necessary by the APRB Chair
• Determine the appropriate structure for each review, based on the size of the unit being reviewed, number and type of academic programs, and budgetary considerations
• Report regularly to Graduate Council and the Council on Educational Policy, with the APRB Chair attending relevant Council meetings as necessary
• Act as liaison with the Provost’s office on matters pertaining to the reviews, including the solicitation of comments on nominators, reviewers and the charge
• Initiate and implement reviews as per the approved schedule of reviews, in consultation with the Senate Executive Director and the Provost’s office
• In coordination with the Office of Institutional Research, oversee the data collection, which includes the request for self-study documents, strategic plans, data and surveys
• Select the External Review Committee (ERC)
• Formulate the Departmental and Schoolwide Charge to External Reviewers, and perform any internal review necessary to accomplish this
• Host the external review committee during their campus visit
• Ensure adherence to the Senate’s guidelines for the disposition of documents and confidentiality

B. Academic Program Review Board Analyst

1. Description
   The APRB has the half-time, year-round support of at least one staff member of the Office of the UCI Division of the Academic Senate: the Academic Program Review Analyst, providing year-round, half-time staff support for the APRB and reporting to the Executive Director of the Academic Senate.

2. Duties
   Under the supervision of the APRB, the Analyst will do the following, in adherence with the review procedures outlined in Section IV:

   • Schedule reviews consistent with the agreed-upon schedule of reviews
   • Establish and maintain contacts between the APRB, the units under review, and the external reviewers regarding the logistics of their visit
   • Assist the Senate Office and Division Senate Chair in contacting prospective reviewers in the name of APRB, and securing their agreement to serve
   • Coordinate the data collection for the review in consultation with the units under review and the UCI Office of Institutional Research
   • Administer undergraduate and graduate student surveys, as formulated by the CEP and GC, and faculty surveys, and provide analysis of results as requested
   • Assemble and distribute the Review Notebook to be sent to the ERC in preparation for the site visit
   • Construct daily review schedules and itineraries for ERC site visits in consultation with the units under review
   • Attend orientation and exit meetings with the review committee and follow up with requests for additional information
   • Ensure members of the ERC understand the UCI campus and school structure
• Monitor reviewer quality and support the APRB and the Senate Office in recruitment of the highest caliber external reviewers
• Assist ERC members with travel and lodging arrangements for the site visit and arrange transportation for the ERC members during the site visit
• Schedule and request follow-up reports from units as per the schedule
• Provide templates for internal self-review documents and for external review reports
• Offer continuous guidance to external review committee members
• Supervise the editing of confidential and non-confidential components of reports
• Transmit ERC reports and all accompanying documents and follow-up reports to the CEP, GC, CORCL, and CPB, as appropriate, and to the Provost’s office
• Maintain the documentation of each review, including the Review Notebook, the ERC report, and all responses and follow-up documents relevant to the ERC report, in adherence with the Senate’s Confidentiality and Disposition of Documents policies

III. STRUCTURE OF REVIEWS

A. Size of Units/Size of the ERC

Previous Senate reviews of the Academic Program Review questioned whether it should be organized on a department-by-department basis or on a school basis. Since the budget and strategic planning control points are all in a Dean’s office or equivalent, the 2013-2014 Special Committee to Review the Academic Program Review Process reiterates that all departments in a school will be reviewed in a single academic year under the auspices of school-wide review, in the hopes that this will realize some efficiencies. This means identifying and recruiting appropriate external reviewers for each respective department in the School, and at least two external reviewers who will add a school-wide perspective.

The scope of the school-wide review should include the dean’s strategic plan for academic development and the administrative structure of the school. This is where we reiterate the recommendation to include a Dean of a comparable school on the ERC. A school-wide perspective is also important for units with undergraduate or graduate degree programs not organized along departmental lines. The scope of the school-wide review should also include an evaluation of the School’s administrative structure and school-wide operations.

Since 2003, departmental and School reviews at UCI have been scheduled simultaneously or very close together. Except in the case of very large Schools, this has proven to be effective and ensures that departmental information is current and readily available to the school-wide reviewers. In the case of large Schools, a series of visits addressing groups of departments may be preferable. It is important that the review structure be communicated clearly to the ERC before the visit.

B. Review of Research

Academic Program Review focuses on the research and teaching in the units, and the scope of the review will not encompass a systematic evaluation of organized research units on campus. CORCL will continue to carry out the Senate’s oversight function in relation to organized research units separately from APRB. The 1999 Committee observed that the proposed joint reviews of UCI academic programs will necessarily include a review of the research activity and productivity of each department as it relates to the professional standing of the faculty and the quality of graduate and undergraduate education in the department. The 2005 Committee found
the current Charges to adequately address research in joint reviews. However, CORCL may request to see relevant APRB deliverables as they pertain to the review of organized research units on campus. These reports will also be shared with the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) in conformity with Divisional Bylaw 115.B.3 which enumerates the duties of the CPB. The adopted procedures should be consistent with the Senate and Divisional Bylaws governing academic program review and do not require further Senate legislation.

C. Review of Interdisciplinary, Multi-School and Inter-Campus Programs
Given the current process of reviewing all departments within a single School, the review of regular curricular programs that are administered across school boundaries poses challenges. Special considerations are also necessary in the case of intercampus programs, such as the Tri-Campus PhD program in Classics (UCI, UCSD, and UCR). These reviews must include formal consultation with the participating faculty and students on the other campuses. The current process of joint reviews, with its focus on local, departmental programs, might accidentally overlook or unintentionally de-emphasize the review of interdisciplinary or multi-campus programs. Such programs need to be identified early on in the review process, listed specifically in the Charge, and brought to the attention of the ERC Chair. Furthermore, the campus visit should include visits with as many of the affiliated Program directors, students, Chairs and Deans as possible and reasonable.

D. Graduate-Only Program Reviews
The Graduate Council reserves the right to conduct its own review of graduate-only programs, whether that review falls in the established schedule or not, or to commission or delegate such a review to the APRB.

E. Self-Supporting Program Reviews
Self-supporting Programs (SSPs) on the UC Irvine campus will certainly require more frequent Academic Review than regular state-supported academic units organized in Schools and Departments. Based on the systemwide policy authority of the Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), guidelines for the establishing and evaluation of SSPs have been developed that the Irvine Division will use.

IV. REVIEW PROCESS

A. Schedule of Reviews
Given the growth of the UC Irvine campus, the 2013-14 Special Committee to Review the Academic Program Review Process sees no way to reduce the review cycle to fewer than 10 years. We note that the 2005 Special Committee already proposed that the review cycle stretch to a ten-year period to reduce the annual budget and workload. That cycle may seem long, but it should be remembered that the conclusion of each academic program review entails a follow-up three years later.

B. Sample Timeline
Every effort is made to ensure that the published review schedule is followed. Most if not all requests for exception have been denied since usually the reason given for a delay is also a good reason not to delay. Similarly, every effort is made to ensure that the collection of data, the
campus visit, the receipt of the external report, review by the relevant Councils, and transmission to the Provost occur within a reasonable timeframe which ensures that the information remains timely and actionable. A sample timeline is provided in Attachment 1.

C. Initiation of the Review
The review begins with formal notification to the Dean that the review is to occur in the following year. Any requests for postponement should be addressed to the APRB for consideration, though in practice these are rarely granted.

D. Data Collection
1. Self-Study Questions
In preparation for a review, the APRB analyst will direct a request to the unit under review for information that will be supplied to the ERC prior to the site visit. This will be a common request that will be sent to all departments or schools under review, although this standard request may be amended by the APRB to address specific issues as it sees fit or as directed by CEP and/or GC. A standardized format should be used for the response from the department. This will allow the work of the APRB and the APRB analyst to proceed more smoothly, and it will facilitate perusal of the review materials by the Senate Councils and administrative officers who may have occasion to examine the results of the reviews. Of primary concern is the need to limit the workload imposed on academic units by the review process. Therefore, self-studies will be restricted to succinct discussions of specific issues facing the unit, rather than having each unit under review compose a discursive and exhaustive integrated self-evaluation.

The request will be transmitted under a cover letter addressed to the Dean. The dean will be asked to forward the departmental self-study questions to each of the Departments for response, and the School will be asked to respond to the Schoolwide self-study questions. Each department self-study must be written by its faculty senate members, and under no circumstances must that duty be delegated to staff. The extent of the dean's contribution to the data gathering and self-evaluation process will differ from department to department, depending on the degree to which the academic programs are organized at the school and Departmental level. It is expected that all departments in a given school will be reviewed in the same year, along with the school-wide review. It is assumed that the portions of the dean's response relating to school-wide academic programs will be applicable to many of the departments under review in a given year. This circumstance should reduce duplication of effort at the dean's level that might otherwise be required, if departments in a given school were reviewed in different years.

The standard request for information may be tailored to ask for more specific data, which shall also be coordinated with CEP and GC. This request should be designed to obtain the information necessary for the external committee to understand the structure, resources, quality, and productivity of the department and the School. The more important task of the department under review should be to produce a realistic assessment of the current status of the department and to enunciate the aspirations of the department for the forthcoming period of several years. The request sent to the department must be designed to elicit such a statement of a strategic academic plan. It is, however, necessary to avoid presenting the ERC with an unreasonable pre-review workload. They cannot realistically be expected to spend more than a few hours perusing any material sent to them in advance. Likewise the burden on the department and School under review must be considered.
A sample set of self-study questions and data prepared for Departments and Schools is included in Attachment 2. The APRB will select and prioritize the self-study questions so as to limit them to no more than five of the most pivotal issues. Departments will be instructed to keep their self-study responses succinct, and write no more than 5 pages in all.

2. Supporting Data
The calibration of suitable data to present in the School and Department self-study has been identified as a problem by some Schools. The Office of Institutional Research provides a fairly comprehensive set of data tables, but these typically require some manipulation on the part of the units under review. Moreover there is not an agreed upon set of information that all Schools provide; the tables requested by the APRB provide a good start toward such a set but still leave considerable room for interpretation.

The 2013-14 Special Committee assumes that the rollout of myData and other standard information systems the campus has been introducing will obviate the need for separate faculty profiles and student data compilations in the APRB process. Instead, the APRB analyst will work with the Office of Institutional Research and the unit preparing to undergo review to ensure that the data available centrally will be tailored to the scope of the academic program review process.

With the introduction of dashboards and services for Institutional Research, including but not limited to myData, Academic Analytics, the campus data warehouse, and the new student information system, the APRB analyst will be able to cull the necessary statistics and data directly from those sources, via the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or the Vice Provost for Academic Planning. It is part of the responsibility of the APRB analyst to assemble those items that can be produced routinely by OIR.

Attachment 3 shows a list of standard data to consider in Academic Program Review. Without overwhelming or distracting units undergoing review, these data should be made available to those units as well as to the ERC. Units under review will focus on certain aspects of their program as guided by selected self-study questions; the ERC will be made aware that not all data are emphasized in each and every review.

3. Surveys
APRB review surveys are administered by the APRB analyst, but correspondence about changes to their design or analysis of results is generally undertaken directly with the CEP or GC and coordinated through the Senate Executive Director. With the introduction of the new Academic Senate Data Management System, the Senate office has improved its survey capacity. Each review should also include the data from the most recent UC Undergraduate Experience survey.

4. Graduate Student Input
In addition to the surveys and time scheduled for graduate students to meet with external reviewers, there should be a routine process for soliciting written graduate student input. The APRB is asked to contact the academic unit’s graduate student representative to submit a formal statement to submit to the external reviewers. This process would be independent of the request for self-study materials, but the statement would be included in the review notebook.

5. Review Notebook
Everything the ERC will need should be contained in a single review notebook. It will be the responsibility of the APRB analyst to solicit this information from the appropriate sources and
assemble the notebook in a standardized format. It will become a permanent part of the documentation associated with each review. The request to departments under review and the resulting departmental responses will be transmitted through the office of the corresponding School Dean (or equivalent administrator), who will be asked to attach any commentary he/she may wish to the departmental response.

The ERC should report on the state of the unit under review as it exists at the time of the review. It is the role of the Academic Senate to monitor the response made by a unit to a prior review of its academic program. As such, the ERC should, as a rule, receive a copy of the previous review only if it is specifically requested. It should be noted that in past years, the ERC has usually requested a copy of the last review of the respective unit.

Following is a list of materials currently included in the Review Notebook:

- Completed self-study questionnaires and data tables
- Survey Results
- Graduate Students’ written statement, if submitted
- Biographical Sketches of Senate faculty
- Organizational Charts of UCI and the School under review
- UCI Catalog
- UCI Map
- Publicity materials provided by the unit under review
- Copy of previous review (if requested)

E. External Review Committee

1. Process for Selection

Depending on department size and enrollments, most departmental review teams will have between one and three members, all of whom will be asked to review the unit as a whole, not be assigned to concentrate on either graduate or undergraduate aspects. In addition, the ERC will comprise one or two external reviewers focusing on the school as a whole.

In coordination with the Senate Chair, the APRB will select members of the ERC from a slate of nominees developed by the APRB. This slate will be constructed by asking each unit under review to submit a list of knowledgeable nominators who could recommend potential reviewers. The APRB and/or the Provost have the option to add names to the slate. Nominators will then be asked to recommend persons suitable to review the department or school in question. The APRB will consider the nominations, construct a list of suitable reviewers in priority order, and direct assign various members of the APRB to contact the potential reviewers to secure their agreement to serve. The APRB will also secure the agreement of one of the ERC members to serve as Chair of the ERC. Nominators may nominate themselves to serve as reviewers and the APRB may appoint them to do so, as long as there are no conflict of interest considerations as defined below.

Persons invited to serve on an ERC should be distinguished scholars well acquainted with the academic discipline of the unit under review. They should hold senior appointments in the same or similar units in academic institutions comparable to the University of California. It is appropriate to appoint faculty from other UC campuses to an ERC, and equally important to form a representative balance of UC and non-UC, public and private, and gender on the final review team. The ERC should also have the representation of at least one person with substantial administrative credentials, such as a current Dean or Provost of an equivalent academic
institution, so the administrative structure and operation of the School can be evaluated in the review. ERC members should not have close personal contacts with and should not have been involved in collaborative relationships with members of the unit under review or with anyone in the School administration within the past five years, as specified below under “Conflict of Interest Considerations”. To assist in the assembly of an appropriately constituted ERC, units under review will be invited by the APRB to recommend persons who can nominate experienced and disinterested reviewers, but the administration of the unit under review will not be asked to recommend their own reviewers, with the exception of names of deans of comparable units, if they are to be included in the ERC. Units will be asked to verify possible conflict of interest among those on the final slate.

Invitations to serve as members of the ERC will be issued in the name of the Chair of the Academic Senate, who will sign the formal letters of invitation. These letters will describe the duties of the ERC and the stipend offered. The recommended stipend for members of the ERC is $1000; the chair of the ERC, who will be responsible for assembling the ERC report, is offered $1500. It is recommended that each ERC include between one and three members per department, depending on the size and complexity of the unit under review, and that the site visit of the ERC extend over a period of at least two and no more than three days, in keeping with current practice.

2. Conflict of Interest Considerations

The APRB will make all efforts to eliminate the possibility of a conflict of interest between the ERC members and the unit under review. Possible definitions of conflict of interest may include the following relationships if they occurred in the last five years. In cases where the relationship is unclear, the APRB will investigate and determine whether the appointment is appropriate.

- A family member or close personal friendship with Department faculty or the Chair
- A former member of the Department
- An applicant to a position at UCI
- A visiting faculty member at UCI
- A former advisor/advisee of UCI faculty
- A close personal research relationship with UCI faculty

APRB members are asked to review these possibilities with potential reviewers before appointing them, and the above points should be included in the letter of appointment. Most of the above situations have arisen at least once in the past five years, requiring last-minute changes to the ERC before the campus visit. One reference in such cases is the Academic Senate policy on conflicts of interest and recusal, available through the APRB analyst.

F. Standard and Specific Charges to the Extramural Review Committee (ERC)

1. Standard Charge

ERCs receive standard charges, one for the school-wide review and one for the Departments to be reviewed (see attachments 4 and 5). All members of the ERC will be asked to examine the evidence provided about unit under review so as to achieve a balanced review of the unit’s academic program and of its administration. In light of the effort to focus the review on a limited set of specific issues, the ERC will respond to this charge in a way that reflects the special issues highlighted in the units under review.
2. Internal Review and Specific Charge
The APRB shall conduct an internal review, the primary focus of which is to create a specific charge, coordinated with CEP and GC. The APRB should include information from the surveys and from the previous review, and it should focus on critical issues whose importance may not be evident from departmental materials, plus those that may have school-wide or campus-wide impact. The APRB is responsible for revising these Charges as dictated by its own experience and as directed by the CEP and GC.

3. Consultation and Distribution of Charges
The content of the specific charge should be coordinated with the CEP and GC, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Graduate and Undergraduate Deans. Final approval of the Charges rests with the CEP and GC, and the APRB will share the approved charges with the units under review.

G. Scheduling of Campus Visit
1. Components of Campus Visit
The campus visit should be scheduled to address all the areas of the charge, and allow for all relevant parties to meet the reviewers. The APRB analyst works closely with the staff at the units under review to ensure that all the necessary components are addressed. The ERC visit will start with a briefing dinner or breakfast before the review begins. This will provide an opportunity to acquaint the ERC with the UCI campus administrative structure and other issues that may not be apparent from the material gathered in the Review Notebook. The APRB will host this orientation, to which the Graduate Dean and Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be invited. The units under review are responsible for setting up appointments with their Deans, faculty and students. The proposed schedule should be shared with the ERC well in advance of the campus visit to allow for time to make any requested modifications.

2. Components of a Department Review Visit
- Orientation meetings with APRB, Undergraduate and Graduate Deans
- Orientation meeting with the EVC
- Orientation meeting with Dean
- Meeting with Department Chair
- Meeting with Department faculty. Faculty should be split into small groups that would lend themselves to productive meetings: i.e., faculty grouped together by research area is sometimes effective, other times by rank (Assistant vs. Associate vs. Full professors). It is worthwhile not grouping together people that may inhibit the contribution of any one member (i.e. Assistant Professors).
- Meeting with Undergraduate Students
- Meeting with Graduate Students
- Meeting with Postdoctoral Scholars (if any)
- Tour of Labs/other space
- Exit meeting with Dean
- Exit meeting with EVC
- Exit meeting with APRB, Undergraduate and Graduate Deans
3. Components of a Schoolwide Review visit
In addition to the orientation and exit meetings described, instead of meeting with individual Department chairs, faculty, and students, school-wide reviewers meet with the following:
- Associate Deans (Graduate and Undergraduate)
- Meeting with School Administrators (Assistant Dean, Department MSOs)
- Joint meeting of all Chairs in the School
- Student Academic Advising staff
- Interdisciplinary Program faculty and students, and Deans of affiliated Schools
- Program Directors and students of academic programs not housed in Departments

4. Fraternization
While a working lunch or dinner involving both ERC members and departmental faculty may sometimes be appropriate, it is important to avoid fraternization with faculty and purely social activities that may compromise the objectivity of the ERC. Any social events involving the ERC and the Dean or faculty in the unit under review require prior approval by the APRB.

H. Receipt of Report
1. Distribution
The ERC will be instructed by the APRB chair and the APRB analyst to write its report as a semi-public document; however, if there are sensitive matters that emerged in the review process which the ERC wishes to comment on, it can do so in a confidential supplement. Such confidential issues might include, but not be limited to, personnel matters, administrative malfeasance, or ingrained conflicts affecting the unit under review. The ERC report should refrain from reproducing ad hominem comments, gossip, or other unverifiable information.

Upon receipt of the external report, the APRB will forward it immediately to the CEP, GC, as well as the unit under review via the corresponding school dean, and solicit timely responses from the department(s) and the Dean. The School is expected to share the report with faculty. The APRB will also forward the report to the Provost, with a description of the Senate’s subsequent steps, and emphasizing that at this stage it is not yet a final document. After the report’s initial distribution, CEP and GC will correspond directly with the unit with specific questions.

2. CEP and GC Evaluation
Communication between the Councils and the unit will continue until each of the Councils has completed its review. Responsibility for evaluation of these items rests with the CEP and GC, each of which will be free to organize its consideration of the review materials and possible action as it sees fit. In meeting these responsibilities the CEP and GC will act independently to consider the academic program matters under their respective jurisdictions. The CEP and GC will be expected to consider the review materials promptly and to prepare an evaluation of the review containing any commentary and recommendations it may choose to include.

3. Final Transmission to Provost / Executive Vice Chancellor and to other Senate bodies
The ERC Report, the responses from the department and school, and the evaluations from the CEP and GC will be transmitted by the Senate Chair to the Provost/EVC, with a request to make the report available also to the Academic Planning Group (APG). Timely delivery of these materials to the EVC is deemed essential and in no way precludes additional actions that may
need to be taken by the CEP and GC in discharge of their responsibilities for academic program review. Transmission of the review to the EVC signifies the completion, though not the closure, of the review.

Copies of all of the materials forwarded to the Provost will be shared with the Council on Research, Computing and Library Resources (CORCL) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) in recognition of the responsibilities and charges of these Councils. The Senate Chair will also forward to the Department and School in question copies of the evaluations prepared by the CEP and GC.

I. Follow-Up

Three years following completion of the review (as marked by submission of final versions of all relevant reports to the Provost), the APRB will ask the Dean of the respective School and the chairs of each of its departments to describe the actions taken in response to the most recent academic program review. These responses will be forwarded by the APRB to the CEP and GC. Following consideration of the follow-up reports by the CEP and GC, they will be forwarded by the Senate Chair to the Provost, as well as to CORCL and CPB, along with any commentary that the respective councils may wish to attach.

J. Closure of Review

Transmittal to the Provost’s office of the follow-up reports and attached commentary will signal formal closure of an academic program review. Formal closure of a review does not foreclose additional actions stemming from a review taken by the CEP or GC in the discharge of their respective responsibilities for academic program oversight.

V. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISPOSITION OF DOCUMENTS

A. General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Review

This document was approved by the Academic Senate Cabinet on August 8, 2000 (Attachment 6). It outlines the circumstances under which review materials may be released, describes the components of a review document, and defines the terms “working documents” and “review products” as they relate to reviews.

B. UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents

This document was approved by the Academic Senate Cabinet on November 21, 2000, and was intended to elaborate on the “General Statement” document, above (Attachment 7). It outlines the phases of a review and describes the types of documents generated and distributed.
## List of Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
<td>Sample Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td>Self-Study Questions for Departments &amp; Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
<td>Standard data request to support Academic Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 4</td>
<td>Charge to External Reviewers: Department Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 5</td>
<td>Charge to External Reviewers: School Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 6</td>
<td>General Statement on Confidentiality, August 8, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 7</td>
<td>UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents, November 21, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3: Standard data request to support Academic Program Review

Information to be provided for the years since the last academic program review of the unit

Instruction:
• Student-credit hours (SCH) for School / Departments (both by Dept Offering Course; and by Payroll Home Dept)
• Information about % taught by FTE; % in different size classes

Financial / Personnel:
• Budget overview including expenditures in several categories (faculty, staff, operations, benefits, etc.).
• External grants (explaining to the ERC that OR numbers may be incomplete because of ORUs or multi-investigator grants that reach across units)
• Enrollment-derived revenues per faculty FTE in the school for each report year
• Philanthropy ($$ raised from Central Advancement records)
• Total school expenditures per student FTE; total school expenditures per faculty FTE
• Personnel (faculty/staff) by different categories and demographics (m/f; URM)
• Organizational charts

Undergraduate students:
• Freshman admissions (applications, admits, SIRs) for School and each major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA)
• Transfer admissions (applications, admits, SIRs) for School and each major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA)
• Enrollment by major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA)
• Retention rates and graduation data

Graduate students:
• M.S. admissions (applications, admits, SIRs) for School and each major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA)
• Ph.D. admissions (applications, admits, SIRs) for School and each major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA); % yield
• Enrollment by major + demographics (m/f; URM; CA)
• Support per capita for PhD candidates: a) from all sources, b) with TA support subtracted
• Block grant funds per capita for all doctoral students in the unit
• Graduation data; % of grads within normative time to degree
• Debt ratio: loan $ per capita, for PhD students only
• Placement data: after 5 and 10 years
### Joint Academic Program Reviews
**Timeline for School of XXX**
**AY 20XX-XX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January – February 20XX</th>
<th>Review Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o APRB notifies Dean about upcoming scheduled review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB meets with Dean, Associate Deans, and Department Chairs to give overview of the process and timeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB requests from Dean – <strong>due by March XX</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) list of suggested nominators for each department/program;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) potential dates for 2-3 day campus visit (targeted for January-February of following year); and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) name of contact person(s) in School to coordinate review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March – September 20XX</th>
<th>Selection of Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Dean informs faculty, staff and students about upcoming review and encourages participation in forthcoming surveys from the Senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB contacts nominators and potential reviewers and assembles review teams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB transmits the survey results from undergraduate and graduate students to the Dean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB sends the self-study questions and data tables to the Dean, with responses <strong>due by September 15</strong> (one unbound original of each and, if possible, an electronic version).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October – November 20XX</th>
<th>Formulation of Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o APRB reviews self-studies and survey data to identify issues for inclusion in the charge to the External Review Committee. APRB sends charge to Council on Educational Policy (CEP) and Graduate Council (GC) for final approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Final charge is forwarded to Dean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 20XX – January 20XX</th>
<th>Planning for Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o APRB arranges hotel accommodations, orientation and exit meetings and oversees the units’ scheduling of the remainder of the meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o APRB mails the Review Notebook (containing the charge, self-study materials, data tables, survey results, and proposed itinerary) to the external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter 20XX</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o External Review Committee conducts 2-3 day campus visit, meeting with campus and school administrators, faculty, students, and key staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter/Spring Quarter 20XX</th>
<th>Senate Review of ERC Report and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o External Review Committee (ERC) submits its report. The Senate Chair forwards report to the Dean with a deadline for response. The EVCP is sent a copy, with notification that Senate review is underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ERC report and Dean’s response are reviewed by GC and CEP; the Councils may contact the unit directly with questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Upon completion of GC and CEP’s initial review, Senate Chair forwards report and Council correspondence to the EVCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>~20XX</th>
<th>Followup and Closure of Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Initiated three years after reports and Senate comments are sent to the EVCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Dean’s Followup report is sent to GC and CEP for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The Dean’s report and GC/CEP comments are sent to the EVCP. This officially closes the review, although GC and CEP may continue to request additional information from the school as they consider necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Program Review  
School of XXX  
AY 20XX-XX  
DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM SELF-STUDY

Instructions

• Please limit your self-assessment to 20 single-spaced pages or less (excluding tables), using the supplied question format (i.e. headings and question numbers) in your responses.

• A set of tables prepared by the Office of Institutional Research (noted below in italics) will be provided that contain much of the information you will need. Please review the data for accuracy and note any corrections made. You are asked to provide the data for tables listed in bold in a specified format (samples are attached). Make direct reference to the data in these tables in your responses. Feel free to supply additional data whenever appropriate.

• Whenever appropriate, include in your response comparisons of your school data to national trends/averages and/or data from similar units at other universities. Also, when appropriate, include comments about trends over time (e.g., improvements or declines) since the last review.

• The self-studies and completed data tables are due by September XX, 20XX. Send one unbound original (and an electronic version, if available) to the coordinator in the Dean’s office for transmittal to the Academic Program Review Board, c/o Jill Kato, Academic Senate, 3700 Berkeley Place, Zot 1325. Please address questions to jkkato@uci.edu.

SECTION 1: ANALYSIS OF PAST REVIEWS (copies available upon request)

1. Briefly characterize the last review of the Department’s undergraduate program(s), conducted in 20xx-xx.
   a. What were the key strengths and weaknesses of the program cited by the external review committee?
   b. Describe the specific steps that have been taken to respond to the recommendations from the last review.

2. Briefly characterize the last review of the Department’s graduate program(s), conducted in 20xx-xx.
   a. What were the key strengths and weaknesses of the program cited by the external review committee?
   b. Describe the specific steps that have been taken to respond to the recommendations from the last review.

SECTION 2: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS

1. Overview of Department
   a. Provide a brief history of the Department and a description of its organization (e.g., degree programs, disciplinary specialties, etc.). Include a description of any formal interactions with other Departments and/or other units on campus.
   b. Provide a list of all current full-time faculty organized alphabetically within rank (include graduate degree institution and a brief set of research interests) (Table 1).
c. Discuss the distribution of the faculty in terms of rank, gender, and ethnicity (Table 2). Provide information about faculty recruitment and retention, including efforts to diversify the faculty, since the Department’s last review. Referring to data from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (Table 3), evaluate the Department’s success in achieving diversity in terms of national availability. Does the Department have a plan, and is the plan being effectively implemented?

d. How many part-time and/or visiting instructors are in the Department and how are they deployed in the instructional program? How many individuals are in the research specialist and professional researcher series and how are they deployed in the program?

e. Describe your system of Departmental governance, in particular the procedures for and effectiveness of faculty involvement in curricular development, instructional resource allocation, and service activities to the School and campus.

f. Describe the Department policy on teaching workload for formal graduate and undergraduate courses including information about course release policies for research and administrative service, and any changes in policy since the last review.

g. What are the strengths of the Department’s research program, and how does the overall research program compare with top national research programs in the discipline/field?

h. Describe the working relationship between the Department and the Dean’s office.

i. Comment on the adequacy of the Department’s operating budget, staff support, and space/facilities/equipment (Table 2).

j. Provide narrative explanation and a brief table of general budget categories and expenditures (no more than a single page) (Table 4)

k. Comment on Development activities at the Department level and provide data on amount and sources of gift funding for the past 5 years (Table 5).

2. Evidence of Faculty Distinction

a. Discuss evidence for faculty/departmental distinction in research, teaching, and service (e.g., faculty research productivity in publications and extramural grant support, scholarly awards and honors, teaching awards, and distinguished service to the school, campus, university, and/or scholarly field).

b. Provide biographical sketches (limit to 3 pages each) for all current full-time Departmental faculty (organized alphabetically).

3. Evaluation of Undergraduate Program

a. Admissions (refer to data in Table 6)

i) Describe efforts the Department makes to recruit and enroll high quality students in its undergraduate programs.

ii) Characterize the demographics of the Department’s undergraduate students. Describe efforts the Department makes to recruit and serve members of underrepresented groups. Describe and comment on steps that the Department has taken to promote diversity. Is the Department’s plan being effectively implemented?

iii) Comment on the number of Departmental majors and minors. Is it adequate, too few, or too many? Comment on the role of the department’s minors.
iv) Describe the criteria for admission into the Department major(s). Are there additional criteria for freshman adopting the Department major beyond the campus-wide criteria? What are the criteria for transfer students who wish to adopt the department major? What criteria or restrictions exist for UCI students in other majors who wish to transfer to the department major?

b. Training (refer to data in Table 6)
   i) Provide an overview of the Department’s undergraduate program, curriculum, and degree requirements. Include a sample 4-year course plan.
   ii) Comment on the undergraduate class-size statistics and percentage of undergraduate courses taught by regular rank faculty. What is the ratio of teaching assistants to student enrollment? Is teaching assistant support adequate?
   iii) Comment on the time to degree for undergraduate majors. Are required courses accessible and offered with sufficient frequency to ensure timely progress toward degree? What does the Department do to provide academic guidance and support for undergraduate majors?
   iv) Referring to the results of the undergraduate student survey (forthcoming from APRS and the Division of Undergraduate Education), how would you characterize student satisfaction with the Department’s undergraduate programs? What do undergraduate students perceive to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the Department?
   v) Comment on the Department’s efforts at professional socialization for undergraduate students. For example, what percentage of students are involved in honors programs, independent study, undergraduate research, small seminars, internships, study abroad, or student chapters of professional societies? List prestigious awards and/or achievements by your undergraduate students.
   vi) Describe how the Department contributes to the education of UCI students not majoring in the Department. What courses are offered as breadth courses for non-majors? What restrictions are placed on non-majors with respect to taking courses offered by the Department?

c. Placement
   i) What can be said about the prospective job and educational opportunities for your Department’s undergraduate majors? Provide any data available regarding placement of undergraduate majors in appropriate jobs or graduate programs. What does the Department do to provide career guidance for undergraduate students?

4. Evaluation of Graduate Program

a. Admissions
   i) Provide an alphabetical list of all current graduate students showing each student’s undergraduate institution, initial quarter of graduate enrollment at UCI, degree sought, and faculty research advisor (Table 7). If no advisor has been selected or assigned, leave blank.
ii) Describe the Department’s success in enrolling high quality students in its graduate programs (*Table 8*). Describe efforts the Department makes to recruit outstanding graduate students (including any efforts supported by the Graduate Division funds).

iii) Characterize the demographics of the Department’s graduate students (*Table 8*). Describe any efforts the Department makes to recruit and retain members of underrepresented groups. Referring to data from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity on national availability for the academic discipline (*Table 9*), evaluate the Department’s success in recruiting and retaining graduate students from underrepresented groups. Describe and comment on steps that the Department has taken to promote diversity. Is the Department’s plan being effectively implemented?

b. Training

i) Provide an overview of the Department’s graduate program(s), curriculum, and degree requirements. Include a sample course plan for each program.

ii) Comment on graduate class-size statistics and percentage of graduate courses taught by regular rank faculty (*Table 8*).

iii) Comment on progress toward degree for graduate students (*Table 8*). Describe any efforts made by the Department since the last review to improve time to degree for its graduate students. What else does the Department do to provide academic guidance and support for graduate students?

iv) Comment on your Departments’ success in providing adequate financial support for its graduate students including in-state, out-of-state, and international students. Provide data on the percentage of current students receiving support, with the amount of support broken down by year in program (*Table 10*). Provide data on the percentage of students supported by university grants/fellowships, federal grants/fellowships, other extramural grants/fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc. (*Table 11*).

v) Referring to the results of the graduate student survey (*forthcoming from APRB*), how would you characterize student satisfaction with the Department’s graduate programs? What do graduate students perceive to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the Department?

vi) Comment on the Department’s efforts at professional socialization for graduate students. Does the Department offer professional issues seminars? What does the department do to train teaching assistants? Does the Department provide opportunities for graduate students to present and discuss their research (e.g., brown bags)? Does the Department provide guidance and assistance to students applying for fellowships and grants? Does the Department take any measures to improve/monitor faculty mentoring quality?

vii) Comment on scholarly productivity of graduate students. Provide a list of publications and conference presentations of all current graduate students (*Table 12*).

c. Placement

i) Provide a list of all graduate students who received their degree in the Department since the last graduate review, including the training period (the month/year they
began the program and when the degree was awarded), the title of the dissertation, the dissertation committee chair, and the student’s current employment (Table 13).

ii) Comment on your Department’s success in placing its graduates in appropriate professional settings.

iii) Comment on and provide a list of postdoctoral researchers associated with the department since the last graduate review (Table 14).

SECTION 3: STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

1. Provide an overall evaluation of the current strengths and weaknesses of the Department and suggest a strategic plan for how the research and teaching programs can be improved without additional resources.

2. If the Department were given additional resources, suggest a strategic plan for how these resources would be used to improve the research and teaching programs.

3. Provide a copy of the most recent Strategic Plan that was transmitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

4. What are the emerging trends in your field nationally in terms of research and teaching specialties? How do your strategic plans for future faculty recruitment, new graduate or undergraduate programs and curriculum revisions fit with those emerging trends?

LIST OF TABLES

(Data provided by OIR and OEOD via APRB unless otherwise noted; Data supplied by Department is in bold font)

Table 1: Department Faculty (Supplied by Department)
Table 2: Faculty and Staff; Department Budget; Extramural Support
Table 3: OEOD Data on Availability of Ph.D. Recipients
Table 4: Budget Expenditures (Provided by OIR)
Table 5: Development Data for FY 20xx-xx through 20xx-xx (Provided by Department)
Table 6: Undergraduate Admissions and Enrollment; Demographics; Departmental Minors; Undergraduate Courses; and Undergraduate Time to Degree
Table 7: Current Graduate Students (Supplied by Department)
Table 8: Graduate Admissions and Enrollment; Demographics; Graduate Courses; Time to Degree
Table 9: OEOD Data on Bachelors Degrees by Gender and Ethnicity
Table 10: Graduate Financial Support for last year data available (Supplied by Department)
Table 11: Graduate Student Support (Supplied by Department)
Table 12: Graduate Student Publications and Conference Presentations (Supplied by Department)
Table 13: Placement of Graduate Students since last Graduate Review (Supplied by Department)
Table 14: Postdoctoral Researchers since last Graduate Review (Supplied by Department)
Joint Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Program Review
School of XXX
AY 20XX-XX
SCHOOL SELF-STUDY

Instructions

• Please limit your self-assessment to 20 single-spaced pages or less (excluding tables), using
  the supplied question format (i.e. headings and question numbers) in your responses.
• A set of tables prepared by the Office of Institutional Research will be provided (noted below in italics) that contain much of the data you will need. Please review the tables for accuracy and note any corrections made. You are asked to provide the data for tables listed in bold in a specified format (samples are attached). Make direct reference to the data in these tables in your responses. Feel free to supply additional data whenever appropriate.
• Whenever appropriate, include in your response comparisons of your school data to national trends/averages and/or data from similar units at other universities. Also, when appropriate, include comments about trends over time (e.g., improvements or declines) since the last review.
• The self-studies and completed data tables are due by September XX, 20XX. Send one unbound original (and an electronic version, if available) to the coordinator in the Dean’s office for transmittal to the Academic Program Review Board, c/o Jill Kato, Academic Senate, 3700 Berkeley Place, Zot 1325. Please address questions to jkkato@uci.edu.

SECTION 1: ANALYSIS OF PAST REVIEWS (copies available upon request)

1. Briefly characterize the last review of the School’s undergraduate programs, conducted in 20xx-xx.
   a. What were the key strengths and weaknesses of the School cited by the external review committee?
   b. Describe the specific steps that have been taken to respond to the recommendations from the last review. If there are instances in which recommendations were not implemented, explain why, and describe plans, if any, to implement these recommendations in the future.

2. Briefly characterize the last review of the School’s graduate programs, conducted in 20xx-xx.
   a. What were the key strengths and weaknesses of the School cited by the external review committee?
   b. Describe the specific steps that have been taken to respond to the recommendations from the last review. If there are instances in which recommendations were not implemented, explain why, and describe plans, if any, to implement these recommendations in the future.

SECTION 2: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS

1. Overview of School
   a. Provide a brief history of the School and a description of its organization (e.g., departments, interdisciplinary programs, centers and organized research units, extradepartmental graduate concentrations or undergraduate minors, etc.). Note any
existing programs that are currently under review or revision and/or any new programs in
the planning stages. Note also any unaffiliated faculty and how they fit into the School’s
overall organization.

b. What are the distinctive characteristics of School-wide research and instructional
programs?
c. Describe and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the administrative structure of the
School. Provide an organizational chart of the School’s administrative structure showing
the titles of all funded positions and reporting relationships (Table 1).
d. What is the faculty’s role in School policy and governance?
e. Describe the working relationship between the Dean’s office and the departments on the
one hand and University administration on the other.
f. Comment on the relationships between the School and other Schools and campus units.
What are the positive and negative effects of these relationships on School functioning?
g. Comment on Schoolwide strategies for the management of faculty resources (Table).
h. Comment on the adequacy of the School’s operating budget (Table 2), staff support, and
space/facilities/equipment.
i. Comment on the School’s involvement in research and grant activity (Table 2).
j. Provide a list of all support staff positions employed by the School (not including
department staff) who provide teaching, research, administrative, clerical, purchasing,
technical, and other kinds of support (Table 3).
k. Provide narrative explanation and a brief table of general budget categories and
expenditures for the fiscal year (no more than a single page) (Table 4).
l. Comment on Development activities at the School level and provide data on amount and
sources of gift funding for the past 5 years (Table 5).
m. Describe and comment on steps at the school level to promote diversity among its faculty
and staff. Using data from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity on national
availability of PhDs for each discipline (Table 6), evaluate the School’s success in
recruiting a diverse faculty and staff. Is the School’s plan being effectively
implemented?

2. Undergraduate Program Issues

a. Describe and evaluate how the School contributes to each of the following goals of
undergraduate education (Table 7).
   i) Recruit, enroll, and retain high quality undergraduate students.
   ii) Recruit, enroll, and retain undergraduate students from underrepresented groups.
       Describe and comment on steps that the School has taken to promote diversity. Is the
       School’s plan being effectively implemented?
   iii) Deal with any special issues concerning transfer students (both internal transfers and
       from outside the School).
   iv) Advise and track progress of students. Describe and comment on the role and
effectiveness of the advising staff at the School level.
   v) Maintain high quality instruction (e.g. qualified instructors and teaching assistants,
       appropriate course sizes) and a well-conceived undergraduate curriculum.
vi) Provide data on the number of TAs per undergraduate student for varying class sizes, ranging from large lectures to small labs (Table 8). Does the School augment campus allocations for Teaching Assistants?

vii) Promote timely progress toward degree for undergraduate students (e.g., availability of required courses, academic advising and counseling, etc.)

viii) Contribute to the education of UCI undergraduate students not majoring in the School.

ix) Involve undergraduates in enrolling extracurricular activities such as research opportunities, independent study, honors programs, internships, and study abroad.

x) Provide financial support opportunities for undergraduate students.

xi) Provide information about appropriate employment and educational opportunities for School graduates.

xii) Comment on the data on graduation rates of new freshman entering as majors in the school, those who graduated from the unit, and from different UCI units (Table 9).

b. What is the impact of the majors not having departmental homes? Who oversees curriculum, and is the oversight as thorough as if the major was in a department? Is there a coherent educational experience for students in these majors?

c. Referring to the results of the undergraduate student survey (forthcoming from APRB and the Division of Undergraduate Education), how would you characterize student satisfaction with the School’s undergraduate programs? What do undergraduate students perceive to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the School?

3. Graduate Program Issues

a. Describe and evaluate how the School contributes to each of the following goals of graduate education (Tables 10-12).

i) Recruit, enroll, and retain high quality graduate students.

ii) Recruit, enroll, and retain graduate students from underrepresented groups. Using data from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity on national availability of graduates with bachelors degrees by gender and ethnicity for each discipline, evaluate the School’s success in recruiting and retaining graduate students from underrepresented groups. Describe and comment on steps that the School has taken to promote diversity. Is the School’s plan being effectively implemented?

iii) Maintain high quality instruction (e.g. qualified instructors and teaching assistants, appropriate course sizes) and a well-conceived graduate curriculum.

iv) Promote timely progress toward degree for graduate students (e.g. availability of required courses, academic advising and counseling, etc.).

v) Promote professional socialization and scholarly productivity for graduate students.

vi) Obtain appropriate employment opportunities for School graduates.

b. Referring to the results of the graduate student survey (forthcoming from APRB), how would you characterize student satisfaction with the School’s graduate programs? What do graduate students perceive to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the School?
c. Describe the role of postdoctoral fellows in the School.

d. Describe the coordination between graduate and undergraduate programs.

SECTION 3: STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

1. Provide an overall evaluation of the current strengths and weaknesses of the School and suggest a strategic plan for how the research and teaching programs can be improved without additional resources.

2. If the School were given additional resources, suggest a strategic plan for how these resources would be used to improve the research and teaching programs.

3. Provide a copy of the most recent Strategic Plan that was transmitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

4. What are the emerging trends in your field nationally in terms of research and teaching specialties? How do your strategic plans for future faculty recruitment, new graduate or undergraduate programs and curriculum revisions fit with those emerging trends?

******************************************************************************

LIST OF TABLES

(Data provided by OIR via APRB unless otherwise noted; Data supplied by School is in bold font)
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I. STRUCTURE OF JOINT PROGRAM REVIEW AND SCHOOL REVIEW

External reviewers are asked to review a specific department and its undergraduate and graduate programs in a School, using this document as a guide. Some departmental reviewers may also participate in a Schoolwide review which covers issues that affect the School in its entirety, such as strategic planning, undergraduate advising, and programs not housed in departments. You are urged to communicate with your review team Chair before, during and after your visit to ensure that s/he is aware of your findings, and make sure that the issues that arise in your review are brought to the attention of the Schoolwide reviewer(s).

Please review the packet of information about the School and Department you will review, as well as the tentative schedule of meetings. If there is additional information you would like to receive or changes you would like to make to the schedule, please let the Senate Office know as soon as possible by contacting Jill Kato, 949-824-5205, jkkato@uci.edu.

II. AREAS FOR REVIEW

We are interested in your overall assessment of the research and teaching accomplishments and potential of the unit you are reviewing. Please make an explicit comparison of the UCI program with comparable programs in other major universities noted for their excellence in research and teaching. Departmental reviews will utilize your expertise in assessing the quality of undergraduate (for use by the Council on Educational Policy) and graduate (for use by the Graduate Council) instructional programs. We also welcome your opinion on issues that may fall between or beyond these areas, such as the quality of post-docs in the department, or non-degree programs (if applicable).

While reviewers are welcome to recommend increased resources for programs under review, it is important to remember that such recommendations must, of necessity, be placed within the context of overall campus priorities. Therefore, recommendations for additional hiring in areas of emphasis, for example, as well as for specific changes in approach, course work, and mentoring will often have a greater impact. Please make specific recommendations and identify the 2-3 most important priorities. The clearer your justifications for these priorities in view of campus-wide priorities and other school-wide issues, the more likely your recommendations will influence the planning process.

III. SPECIFIC AREAS OF INQUIRY

It will be of great help to us if you would incorporate the following specifics into your review, addressing undergraduate, graduate, and research programs in your report, following the structure of the charge. Our primary concern is the quality of the faculty, students, and the department’s potential for distinction.

A. Undergraduate Programs (B.S. programs and minors relevant to department under review)

1. Teaching – Instruction
   o How would you describe the overall quality of instruction provided in the department by faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants?
o Is the percentage of courses taught by regular-ranks faculty (vs. lecturers, visitors, etc.) appropriate for this discipline and similar to what other good departments in the field do at comparable universities?

o How appropriate are the pedagogical approaches used in the classroom?

o What suggestions do you have for enhancing the quality of instruction in the department?

o To what extent do faculty participate in campuswide or discipline-specific faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning?

o What do course evaluations indicate about the quality of teaching in the department?

o What areas of teaching could be enhanced or improved?

o Are class sizes appropriate for effective learning?

2. Teaching Assistants

o How does the department train new Teaching Assistants, and to what extent is this training adequate or appropriate for the discipline?

3. Curriculum for Majors

o When was the curriculum for the major(s) last reviewed?

o To what extent do faculty regularly discuss and review the curriculum?

o How would you assess the overall design, breadth, and rigor of the undergraduate curriculum?

o How well does it reflect current thinking about the discipline?

o How are special types of courses functioning, such as foundation courses, core courses, electives, and undergraduate research courses?

o Can students expect to complete the proposed course of study in four years?

o What suggestions do you have regarding strengthening study in the major(s)?

o To what extent does the curriculum actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved?

o To what extent should the current set of undergraduate majors be reduced or expanded?

o How well do the majors offered reflect what is being taught at the best departments in the same academic fields?

o What steps has the department undertaken to integrate summer course work into the curriculum?

o To what extent do summer course offerings reflect the same quality as during the academic year?

4. Curriculum for Non-Majors

o How well does the department serve non-majors?

o Are the courses offered for non-majors well-conceived and well-taught?

o Are the restrictions placed on non-majors with respect to taking Departmental courses appropriate?

5. Curriculum and Research Opportunities

o To what extent do students have the opportunity to engage with faculty in undergraduate research projects?

o At the lower division level, are laboratory opportunities adequate?

o At the upper division?

o What suggestions do you have for strengthening undergraduate research opportunities provided by the department?

6. Advising and Mentoring

o To what extent does the department provide adequate advising and counseling for its majors?

o What is the level of faculty participation in advising and mentoring of undergraduates?

o What opportunities do students have to interact with faculty outside the classroom?
What suggestions do you have for strengthening advising and mentoring?
To what extent does advising ensure that all majors understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements?
What do students say about the accessibility and quality of academic advising by faculty, staff, and peer advisors?
What areas, if any, need improving?
How are transfer students advised?
What particular problems do transfer students face and how does advising respond to those problems?

7. **Student Outcomes**
- What are students expected to know or be able to do as a result of completing the major?
- How satisfied are students with the quality of undergraduate education provided by the department?
- To what extent are students retained in the major and graduated in a timely fashion?
- Where do students go after graduation and how satisfied are they with the preparation provided by their undergraduate education?
- To what extent has the department developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its student learning goals?
- To what extent do course syllabi reflect the learning goals and outcomes expected of students in the course?
- To what extent are students in the major making sufficient academic progress, especially during their first academic year, and how could academic progress be improved?
- Does the department regularly assess student learning outcomes in the major?
- If so, to what extent are the results used for the improvement of teaching and learning?

B. **Graduate Programs** (Graduate degrees, emphases and concentrations housed in the unit)

1. **Program Quality**
   - How would you judge the overall quality of the graduate program?
   - In general, are the graduates well-trained to begin careers related to their degree?

2. **Program Design**
   - Does the program reflect the strength of the faculty?
   - Is the size of the graduate program commensurate with the number of active faculty?
   - How well does the graduate program reflect current thinking about the discipline, and how can the department address any significant gaps or omissions in the program?
   - Does the unit provide training for its graduate students in state-of-the-art techniques and paradigms, and provide a general overview in the field?

3. **Long-Range Planning**
   - In many fields, long-range planning and strategic choices about areas of teaching and research are necessary. Do you believe that this unit has an imaginative, workable long-range plan that will allow it to make major contributions to the discipline and to pursue appropriate specializations with distinction?

4. **Recruitment and Support**
   - Does the program draw from the pool of the best available potential graduate students?
o Have you suggested or would/will you suggest that your own undergraduates apply for graduate study in this program?
o Is there adequate graduate student support, and how does it compare with similar institutions?

5. **Time-to-Degree and Mentoring**
o What is the time-to-degree expectation, and is it comparable to other institutions of this size and scope?
o Is there active mentoring of graduate students?
o Do advisors meet with advanced students at appropriate intervals?
o Are students assisted with job placement in related careers?

6. **Placement**
o Are graduates well-placed?

C. **Department**
o Do the current structures make sense for fostering the research and teaching in the field that you are reviewing?
o Are there closely related units at UCI or other University of California campuses where more collaboration should be undertaken?
o Are there appropriate support facilities such as libraries, research and teaching space, and computer labs and training?
o What is the Department’s distinction or potential for distinction?
o What specific changes would you suggest to move this department to the next level, with or without additional resources?

D. **Diversity**

1. **Faculty and Staff**
o Comment on the diversity (e.g. gender, racial/ethnic) of the Department. What efforts have been made to recruit, hire, and retain underrepresented administrators, faculty, and staff? Have these efforts been effective?
o Are school resources (including space) distributed so that they advance diversity in teaching and scholarship programs in the most effective way?
o How well-integrated are underrepresented faculty into the School and how much input do they have on curriculum?

2. **Graduate Students**
o Comment on the diversity (e.g. gender, racial/ethnic diversity) of the Department’s graduate students. What efforts have been made to recruit and retain underrepresented graduate students? Have these efforts been successful?
o How effective is the Department in serving underrepresented students?
o How might the Department contribute more fully to teaching underrepresented students (i.e., counseling services, curriculum, tutoring services)?
o Is the time to degree of underrepresented students comparable to that of other students?

IV. **FINAL REPORT**

We request that External Reviewers submit their report, or at least a thorough summary, immediately following their visit to UCI. Appropriate administrative support will be provided upon request.
The reports of the departmental reviewers will be collected by the ERC Chair and incorporated into the final report. The final report will be submitted to the APRB (not to department or program faculty or administration) via e-mail to jkkato@uci.edu or first-class mail to Jill Kato, Academic Senate Office, 3700 Berkeley Place South, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-1325 no later than two weeks after the on-site visit.

All reports will then be considered in depth by the appropriate Senate Councils (the Graduate Council for graduate programs and the Council on Educational Policy for undergraduate programs) for approval and adoption by the UCI Academic Senate. The External Reviewers' report will also be transmitted to the Dean, department or interdepartmental program reviewed, and faculty, and, once it is adopted by the Senate, to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP). After transmittal to the EVCP, these reports are accessible by Academic Deans and Senate faculty. The final portion of the review process occurs three years later when progress on specific action items noted in the review is discussed between the appropriate Senate Council and the program in question.

We welcome your comments on the review process itself. How useful were the materials provided and information gained during your campus visit? Were these enough to make an adequate assessment of the program you reviewed? If not, what would have been helpful to have?

We thank you very much for your efforts on our behalf.
Joint Academic Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs  
**School of XX**  
**Date XX, 20XX**  
CHARGE TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS  
FOR SCHOOL-WIDE REVIEW

**I. STRUCTURE OF JOINT PROGRAM REVIEW AND SCHOOL REVIEW**

The Schoolwide review is intended to cover issues that affect the School in its entirety, such as strategic planning, undergraduate advising, and academic programs not housed in departments. It also incorporates the findings of the department and program reviews, which take place concurrently with the Schoolwide review. The reviewer(s) responsible for the schoolwide review are urged to communicate with departmental reviewers before, during, and after their visit to ensure that their findings are incorporated into the final report.

Please review the packet of information about the School and the tentative schedule of meetings. If there is additional information you would like to receive or changes you would like to make to the schedule, please let the Senate Office know as soon as possible by contacting Jill Kato, 949-824-5205, jkkato@uci.edu.

**II. GUIDELINES**

We are interested in your overall assessment of school-wide programs, services, resources and structural issues. This review will also include graduate and undergraduate instructional programs not housed in departments. **Please make an explicit comparison between the School and comparable units in other major universities noted for their excellence in research and teaching.** We welcome your opinion on issues that may fall between or beyond these areas.

While reviewers may recommend increased resources, it is important to remember that such recommendations must, of necessity, be placed within the context of overall campus priorities. Therefore, recommendations for additional hiring into areas of emphasis, for example, as well as for specific changes in approach, course work, mentoring, etc., will often have a greater impact. Please make specific recommendations and identify the 2-3 most important priorities. The clearer your justifications for these priorities in view of campus-wide priorities and other school-wide issues, the more likely your recommendations will influence the planning process.

**III. SPECIFIC AREAS OF INQUIRY**

Please incorporate the following specifics into your review, addressing graduate, undergraduate, and research programs. In doing so, please include your observations on the quality of the faculty and the School’s potential for distinction.

**A. Schoolwide Issues**

- Comment on the Administration of the School, including the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Dean, and any other officers that interact with academic programs.
- Are school resources (including space) distributed so that they advance the teaching and scholarship programs in the most effective way?
- Does the current administrative structure make sense for fostering excellence in research and teaching?
- Is the administration effective in its relationship to other schools and to units outside the school?
B. Undergraduate Issues

1. Undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction
   - What suggestions do you have for enhancing the quality of instruction in the School?
   - Is the School utilizing Teaching Assistants most effectively?
   - Is workload shared equitably across departments?
   - How might the School contribute more fully to teaching undergraduate courses that serve undergraduates outside the School?
   - Comment on the quality, quantity, cohesiveness and relevance of schoolwide requirements for the School’s majors.

2. Advising and Mentoring
   - How effective is undergraduate peer advising and the Counseling Office?
   - How effectively does the School serve undeclared students?
   - How effectively is the School serving external and internal transfer students?
   - What suggestions do you have for strengthening advising and mentoring?
   - Is the educational environment appropriate?
   - Are students satisfied with their education?

C. Graduate Programs and Issues

1. Interdisciplinary Programs
   - How well do the School’s interdisciplinary programs relate to each other?
   - Are there important elements missing?
   - Are there overlaps and redundancies?
   - Could these be organized in a more efficient way?

2. Teaching Assistants
   - Is the workload of Teaching Assistants appropriate?
   - Is it uniform across the school?

3. Time-to-Degree
   - Are the actual times to degree of the programs in the school appropriate?

D. Diversity

1. Schoolwide issues
   - Comment on the diversity (e.g. gender, racial/ethnic) of the School, including the hiring and retention of administrators, faculty, and staff as well as graduate and undergraduate student enrollment and attrition.
   - What efforts have been made to recruit, hire, and retain underrepresented administrators, faculty, and staff, and to recruit and retain underrepresented graduate and undergraduate students?
o Have the efforts to recruit, hire, and retain underrepresented administrators, faculty, and staff as well as to recruit and retain underrepresented graduate and undergraduate students been successful?
o Are school resources (including space) distributed so that they advance the teaching and scholarship programs in the most effective way?
o How well-integrated are underrepresented faculty into the School and how much input do they have on curriculum?
o Have recent attempts to hire underrepresented faculty been effective?

2. **Undergraduate Issues**
   o How effective is the School in serving underrepresented students?
   o How might the School contribute more fully to teaching underrepresented students, (i.e. Counseling services, curriculum, tutoring services?)

3. **Graduate Issues**
   o How effective is the School in serving underrepresented students?
   o How might the School contribute more fully to teaching underrepresented students, (i.e. Counseling services, curriculum, tutoring services?)
   o Is the time to degree of underrepresented students comparable to that of non-underrepresented students?

**IV. SUBMISSION AND USE OF REPORTS**

We request that External Reviewers submit their report, or at least a thorough summary, immediately following their visit to UCI. Appropriate administrative support will be provided upon request.

Please submit the completed, final report to the APRB (not to department or program faculty or administration) via e-mail to jkkato@uci.edu or first-class mail to Jill Kato, Academic Senate Office, 3700 Berkeley Place South, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-1325 no later than two weeks after the on-site visit.

All reports will then be considered in depth by the appropriate Senate Councils (the Graduate Council for graduate programs and the Council on Educational Policy for undergraduate programs) for approval and adoption by the UCI Academic Senate. The External Reviewers' report will also be transmitted to the Dean, department or interdepartmental program reviewed, and faculty, and, once it is adopted by the Senate, to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP). After transmittal to the EVCP, these reports are accessible by Academic Deans and Senate faculty. The final portion of the review process occurs three years later when progress on specific action items noted in the review is discussed between the appropriate Senate Council and the program in question.

We welcome your comments on the review process itself. How useful were the materials provided and information gained during your campus visit? Were these enough to make an adequate assessment of the program you reviewed? If not, what would have been helpful to have?

We thank you very much for your efforts on our behalf.
General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Review
Academic Senate, University of California, Irvine Division

Academic reviews of departments, schools, centers, and programs are carried out by the Academic Senate of the University of California Irvine. Reviews may be carried out as part of a periodic review process or as a special case. This statement describes the general policy of the Academic Senate regarding confidentiality and access to written materials generated in these reviews. Review materials from an Academic Senate review shall conform to this General Policy on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Reviews.

A Review is carried out by a specially convened Review Committee, which may consist of UCI Academic Senate or administrative members, extramural members, or both.

Written materials generated in a review may include, but are not restricted to, materials prepared by the unit under review, self-study documents, and information from a variety of sources, including surveys, questionnaires, letters, etc. These materials are the "working documents." Some working documents, such as letters or surveys, may be designated as confidential by the supervising Senate Councilor Committee. Confidential working documents will be destroyed upon completion of the Review.

The product of an academic review carried out with Senate participation includes a report of the Review Committee, responses by the unit under review, and analysis by one or more Councils or Committees of the Academic Senate. These are the "Review products."

Working documents and review products are intended solely for internal deliberations and analysis by the Academic Senate in the performance of its responsibilities for oversight of academic curriculum and academic programs.

The review products are forwarded to the administrative officer designated by the Chancellor, usually the Executive Vice Chancellor. They are also forwarded to the designated head of the reviewed unit, and non-confidential portions of the review products may be forwarded to any other Senate agency and academic administrator with a direct interest in the outcome of the review. Distribution of the review product is the means by which the Senate informs the relevant campus agencies of the outcome of a review.

The Review Committee may mark portions of the review product as "confidential." Portions marked confidential will be available to the Senate councils or committees to which the Review Committee reports directly, the Chair of the Academic Senate, members of the Reviewed unit, and the designated administrative officer.

Following distribution of the review product, review materials will be housed by the Office of the Academic Senate. Review products may be accessed by any current member of the Academic Senate for purposes of internal University deliberations only. Documents that are released to Senate members shall exclude confidential sections. The form of access may include release of the review documents, or access to the review documents in the Offices of the Academic Senate. The form of access will be determined by the Senate Chair, in consultation with the Cabinet of the Academic Senate.

Adopted by the Cabinet of the Academic Senate, Irvine Division, on August 8, 2000.
UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents  
(Approved November 21, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet)

The UCI Division of the Academic Senate conducts periodic reviews of the academic programs under its jurisdiction. Authority for conduct of these reviews rests under Divisional Bylaws with the Council on Educational Policy (CEP) for undergraduate academic programs and the Graduate Council (CG) for graduate programs. Reviews are scheduled to occur on a seven year cycle. During academic year 2000 – 2001, the GC and CEP will conduct their reviews of the graduate and undergraduate programs of the School of Biological Sciences under the Joint Review Procedure adopted by the Cabinet June 11, 1999. The policy described here is intended to elaborate the General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Reviews of August 8, 2000 for application to the Biological Sciences Review in question and to serve as a model for the specific policies applicable to future academic program reviews.

Review of a given academic unit occurs in six phases:

1. **Data gathering and self study.** Materials generated in this phase result from a request submitted to the unit under review and data gathered from other sources. These materials are supplied to the Extramural Review Committee (ERC), which also receives a written charge (see phase 2).

2. **Site visit and report by an Extramural Review Committee.** In response to their charge, and following a site visit to the campus, the ERC submits a written report on their findings.

3. **Academic unit response.** This phase permits the unit under review to respond to and comment on the ERC Report.

4. **Analysis of the ERC report and academic unit response.** During this phase the CEP and GC separately consider the collected review documents as they pertain to their respective responsibilities for undergraduate and graduate programs; the Councils may also engage in dialog with the unit under review to obtain clarification or make additional inquiries.

5. **Commentary and recommendations from CEP and GC.** CEP and GC generate their written commentary and recommendations. These are distributed, along with other pertinent documentation, to other agencies of the Senate, to designated administrators, and to the unit under review.

6. **Follow-up and closure.** Two years after the submission of their commentary and recommendations CEP and GC review the response by the academic unit to the review. This brings a review to formal closure but does not preclude further Council action in response to a review.
Additional details of the review process as it currently operates can be found in the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews adopted by the Divisional Cabinet on June 11, 1999.

The present document is intended to enunciate Senate policy for access to and disposition of the Academic Program Review Documents. These documents can be divided into three categories:

1. **Working Materials.** These include the data and self-study materials detailed in Attachment 4 of the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews and tabular information requested from the UCI Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management (OASIM) as detailed in Attachment 5. The working material also includes the results of surveys of students, former students, and faculty and staff of the unit under review and any confidential communications from individual members of these groups that have been directed to the Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS) or the ERC. It is also appropriate to include with the working materials copies of any survey instruments used, any letters soliciting commentary from students, faculty, staff, and former students, the Request to the unit under review (Attachment 4), and the charge to the ERC (Attachment 3). It is the responsibility of the APRS to identify those components of the working materials that are to be considered confidential.

2. **Review Product.** The review product consists of the ERC report, the response(s) of the academic unit to that report, and summary commentary on the review and recommendations prepared by CEP and GC. These are the materials that will be distributed to report the outcome of the review. They will be delivered to the Chancellor (or his designee), to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies, to the chief administrator of the unit under review, to the administrators of other academic units with a direct interest in the product of the review, and to the Senate Councils on Planning and Budget (CPB) and Research, Computing, and Library Resources (COR). The APRS will make clear to the ERC and others who contribute to the review product how it will be distributed and used.

3. **Closure Documents.** Closure documents are generated during the follow-up and closure phase of the review which occurs two years after delivery of the review product. This phase of the review is detailed in Attachment 2 of the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews.

Access to the working documents, review product, and closure documents will be governed by the following policies:

1. Prior to and during phase 5 of the review the above-defined working materials and review product will be available only to the members of the GC and CEP (and pertinent Senate staff) in exercise of their responsibilities for academic program review.

2. At the end of phase 5, and prior to distribution of the review product, the review product and working materials of the review will be collected in the Senate Office and any confidential components of the working materials will be permanently destroyed by the APRS.
3. Following delivery of the review product any current member of the Academic Senate may view the working materials and review product in the Senate Office for purposes of internal University deliberations only. It is the responsibility of the current Senate Chair to remove any confidential material from any copy of the review product released to a Senate Member.

4. Follow-up documents will be added to the archived review materials when the review is closed. It is the responsibility of the current Senate Chair to remove any confidential material from any copy of the follow-up documents released to a Senate Member.

5. The current Senate chair may, in consultation with the Cabinet, authorize other forms of access to or release of archived review materials.