

Review of the Academic Review Process at UC Irvine, 2005-2013 May 2014

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 the logistics of preparing the visit, and the APRB members should focus more on review quality and process rather than on preparations. Committee members agree that external reviewers need more guidance, both for the visit and 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. That would help ensure that the campus ties the results of program reviews to strategic planning in the units and campus-wide. And 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 Irvine Senate in December 1998, and after the due process of consultations, the process was finalized in June 1999. Some UC campuses review graduate and undergraduate programs separately, as was the practice at UCI until 1999. Others review the graduate and undergraduate programs of a given academic unit together. The 1999 Subcommittee'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 to “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.

Review of the Academic Review Process at UC Irvine, 2005-2013
May 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Academic Senate Responsibility with respect to Program Review	
A. Mandate for Academic Program Reviews	5
B. Allocation of Responsibilities for Reviews.....	5
II. Management of the Review Process	
A. Academic Program Review Board (APRB)	5
1. Description	
2. Duties	
B. Academic Program Review Board Analyst	6
1. Description	
2. Duties	
III. Structure of Reviews	
A. Size of Units/Size of External Review Committee (ERC)	7
B. Review of Research	7
C. Review of Interdisciplinary, Multi-School and Inter-Campus Programs	8
D. Graduate-Only Program Reviews	8
E. Self-Supporting Programs	8
IV. Review Process	
A. Schedule of Reviews.....	8
B. Sample Timeline	8
C. Initiation of Review	9
D. Data Collection	9
1. Self-Study Questions	
2. Supporting Data	
3. Surveys	
4. Graduate Student Input	
5. Review Notebook	
E. External Review Committee	11
1. Process for Selection	
2. Conflict of Interest Considerations	
F. Charge to External Review Committee (ERC).....	12
1. Standard Charge	
2. Internal Review and Specific Charge	
3. Consultation and Distribution of Charges	
G. Scheduling of Campus Visit	13
1. Components of a Campus Visit	
2. Departmental Review Visit	
3. Schoolwide Review Visit	
4. Fraternalization	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

H. Receipt of Report	14
1. Distribution	
2. CEP and GC Evaluation	
3. Transmission to Provost and to other Senate bodies	
I. Follow-Up	15
J. Closure	15
V. Confidentiality and Access to Documents	
A. General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Review (adopted August 8, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet)	15
B. UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents (approved November 21, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet).....	15
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....	16

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 Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a three-year term and report regularly to the Chairs of CEP and CG, 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 Subcommittee 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 Special 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, it is recommended to restrict the self-study to succinct discussion 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 the five (5) or so most pivotal issues. Departments will be instructed to keep their self-study responses succinct, and write no more than 5 pages.

2. Supporting Data

Obtaining 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 administrators 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 Schoolwide 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 schoolwide 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, Schoolwide 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. Fraternalization

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

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

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