

**Joint Review of Academic Programs  
Description and Procedures  
May 2005**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Review of Academic Programs is one of the most important, time consuming, and expensive Senate Activities. If the reviews are well done, they can significantly impact a wide variety of programmatic and budgetary decisions that are important for the future of the University. An important aspect of shared governance is that the Academic Senate controls the review process, but works closely with the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Deans to provide the University Administration with the desired data, evaluations and information. As such, these reviews need to be performed as fairly, efficiently and effectively as possible.

In 2005 a Special Committee to Review the Review Process (hereafter called the 2005 Special Committee) was formed to evaluate the effectiveness of the current joint review process and recommend modifications for the future. The Committee consisted of Kenneth Janda, Professor of Chemistry and Chair-Elect of the Senate; William Reeburgh, current chair of the Academic Program Review Subcommittee; Matthew Foreman, previous chair of Graduate Council; Rudi Berkelhamer, previous chair of the Council on Educational Policy; Karen Lawrence, Dean of the School of Humanities; Kathy Haines, Assistant Dean of the School of Humanities; Michael Clark, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor; and Heike Rau, Academic Program Review Officer. At its first meeting, and after interviewing several of the participants in recent reviews, it was decided that the Joint Review process first established in 1999 has worked well enough that it only needed to be optimized based on experience, rather than completely revamped. It was also decided that a detailed review document should be prepared to guide the personnel who will work on future reviews. This is that document.

This document and the attachments incorporate the original procedures recommended by the Senate's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews in 1999 (hereafter called the 1999 Subcommittee), as modified by the Graduate Council (GC) and the Council on Educational Policy (CEP).

After the 1999 Subcommittee completed its work, the Senate conducted seven reviews under its recommended joint graduate-undergraduate review process. This document has been modified to reflect the combined experience of those seven reviews and the 2005 Special Committee's subsequent deliberations on the review process.

Although most of the 2005 Special Committee's recommended changes are minor, several are worth summarizing here. Among these is that the next review cycle be spread over 10 years. It is also recommended that the Chair of the Academic Program Review Subcommittee be appointed by the Committee on Committees, hold a seat on the Academic Senate Cabinet, and be granted compensation equal to one course release in recognition of the time it takes to perform this job well. In addition, since we are recommending that the current joint review structure be extended into the future, a bylaw should be prepared to officially establish the Academic

Program Review Subcommittee, its composition, and its relationship to the Graduate Council and Council on Educational Policy.

Finally, in contrast to the original, this document now includes sections on reviewing interdisciplinary programs, on conflict-of-interest concerns when selecting external reviewers, and on confidentiality and the disposition of program review documents. It also clarifies the roles of the Graduate and Undergraduate Deans, the EVC and the two Councils in formulating the Charge. In short, this document has become a procedural manual for the Senate to use in generating meaningful, productive program reviews.

Joint Review of Academic Programs  
Description and Procedures  
May 2005

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I. Academic Senate Responsibility with respect to Program Review</b>	
A. Mandate for Academic Program Reviews .....	5
B. Allocation of Responsibilities for Reviews.....	5
<b>II. Management of the Review Process</b>	
A. Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS).....	5
1. Description	
2. Duties	
B. Academic Program Review Officer (APRO) .....	6
1. Description	
2. Duties	
<b>III. Structure of Reviews</b>	
A. Size of Units/Size of External Review Committee (ERC) .....	7
B. Review of Research .....	8
C. Review of Interdisciplinary, Multi-School and Inter-Campus Programs .....	9
D. Graduate-Only Program Reviews .....	9
<b>IV. Review Process</b>	
A. Schedule of Reviews.....	9
B. Sample Timeline .....	9
C. Initiation of Review .....	10
D. Data Collection .....	10
1. Self-Study Questions	
2. Data Tables	
3. Surveys	
4. Graduate Student Input	
5. Review Notebook	
E. External Review Committee .....	12
1. Process for Selection	
2. Conflict of Interest Considerations	
F. Charge to External Review Committee (ERC).....	13
1. Standard Charge	
2. Internal Review and Specific Charge	
3. Consultation and Distribution of Charges	
G. Scheduling of Campus Visit .....	14
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 .....	15
1. Distribution	
2. CEP and GC Evaluation	
3. Transmission to EVC and other Senate bodies	
I. Follow-Up .....	16
J. Closure .....	16
<b>V. Confidentiality and Access to Documents</b>	
A. General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Review, (Adopted August 8, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet) .....	16
B. UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents (Approved November 21, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet).....	16
<b>LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....</b>	<b>17</b>

## **I. ACADEMIC SENATE RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO PROGRAM REVIEWS**

### **A. Mandate for Academic Program Reviews**

Periodic review of academic programs is a well established practice throughout the University of California, but the 1999 Subcommittee was unable to identify a formal universitywide mandate or procedure for the reviews. Each campus appears to have developed its own practices. On some campuses the reviews are best viewed as administrative functions carried out with the assistance of the local Academic Senate Division. In other cases the reviews appear to be firmly under the control of the local Academic Senate Division, which reports its findings to various administrative officers. UCI is in the latter group, 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 Library Resources (CORCLR) does not refer to any responsibilities for program review, but CORCLR does routinely conduct reviews of Organized Research Units at UCI.

## **II. MANAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **A. Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS)**

#### **1. Description**

Faculty supervision of the review process is by a standing joint subcommittee of the CEP and GC, called the Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS). 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 APRS Chair will receive Senate Compensation.

*Membership:* In addition to the Chair, the APRS has four Senate faculty members, two each appointed by the Chairs of the CEP and GC 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 Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning serves as an *ex officio* member of the APRS, providing an opportunity for direct input from and communication with the Administration.

#### **2. Duties**

The function of the APRS is to carry out the review process as outlined in Section IV. The APRS is charged with producing the reviews and delivering the reviews to the CEP, GC, and Executive Vice Chancellor in a timely and efficient manner. It is the

responsibility of the latter agencies, not the APRS, 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 APRS 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 APRS 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 and communicate regularly with Graduate Council and the Council on Educational Policy, with the APRS Chair attending relevant Council meetings as necessary;
- Act as liaison with the EVC'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 EVC;
- 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; and
- Ensure adherence to the Senate's guidelines for the disposition of documents and confidentiality.

## **B. Academic Program Review Officer (APRO)**

### **1. Description**

The APRS 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 Officer (APRO). The APRO provides year-round, half-time staff support for the APRS and reports to the Executive Director of the Academic Senate.

### **2. Duties**

Under the supervision of the APRS, the APRO 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 APRS, the units under review, and the external reviewers regarding the logistics of their visit;
- Assist the APRS in contacting prospective reviewers in the name of the Chair of the Academic Senate, 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 Analytical Studies and Information Management (OASIM);
- 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;
- 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;
- Transmit ERC reports and all accompanying documents and follow-up reports to the CEP, GC, EVC, CORCLR and CPB, as appropriate;
- 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**

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).

The 1999 Subcommittee was unanimous in its belief that joint review of the graduate and undergraduate programs of the larger UCI schools would be an unwieldy and, ultimately, unsatisfactory process. For one of the larger UCI schools (e.g., Social Sciences, Humanities) an Extramural Review Committee (ERC) of 2-3 reviewers per department is required to achieve minimal coverage of the array of academic programs and disciplines. Large ERCs take time to assemble, it is difficult to find a time suitable for all members of a large committee to visit, and a large committee of persons residing in widely dispersed locations may be unable to generate a timely report. A more manageable ERC of 3-6 would be unreasonably burdened, if asked to consider all aspects of the academic program of one of these larger schools, and some academic programs or disciplines are almost certain to feel slighted by the coverage that could be accorded them by a smaller committee.

The 1999 Subcommittee therefore proceeded with the understanding that joint program review at UCI should be organized on a department-by-department basis, where for purposes of this document the term department should be understood to include interdisciplinary degree granting programs (e.g., Asian American Studies). This plan would foresee review of 5-8 departments per year on a seven year cycle. The Senate's review committee (see Management of the Review

process, above) may wish to negotiate alternative arrangements with those academic units for which reviews on a departmental basis are mutually agreed not to be appropriate. For instance, in the case of smaller, closely related departments (e.g., foreign languages) or departments with no undergraduate program (e.g., College of Health Sciences (CoHS) basic science departments) the review team might be asked to report simultaneously on more than one department. Ideally, all departments in a school will be reviewed in a single academic year, followed by the school-wide review, in the hopes that this will realize some efficiencies. For instance, this might reduce the burden on the Dean of the school under review and also make available the materials from the departmental reviews if desired for the school-wide review.

To ensure that all aspects of the academic programs of a given school are adequately reviewed, CEP felt it critical that a separate review of school-wide contributions to the academic programs also be conducted. The scope of the school-wide review should include the dean's strategic plan for academic development and the administrative structure of the school. Many aspects of academic programs may be delivered by entities other than departments. Indeed, in some academic units the department may not be the primary delivery agency. Thus, the school-wide review is especially important for schools 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.

In recent reviews (2003-2005), departmental and School reviews 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 Schoolwide reviewers. In the case of large Schools, a series of visits addressing groups of departments would be preferable.

It is important that the review structure be communicated clearly to the ERC before the visit.

## **B. Review of Research**

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 the 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.

It is not believed these joint academic program reviews should include a systematic review of organized research units at UCI, and the 1999 Subcommittee recommend that such reviews continue as in the past under the supervision of the CORCLR. Accordingly, the CORCLR should not be party to the joint academic program reviews. It should, however, receive the final reports generated by the joint academic program review process, inasmuch as these reports may inform its own process of reviewing the organized research units. 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. It was the 1999 Subcommittee's opinion that 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, there is a challenge in reviewing programs that are inter- or cross-disciplinary, crossing Departmental, School, or campus boundaries. The graduate program in Networked Systems, the Arts, Computation and Engineering (ACE) graduate program, and the Transportation Science graduate program are examples of programs that cross School boundaries both in their curriculum and administration. There is also a joint undergraduate degree in Computer Science and Engineering between the Schools of Engineering and Information & Computer Sciences. Furthermore, there are graduate and undergraduate degree programs with a strong presence in more than one School: Psychology and Social Behavior (Social Ecology), Cognitive Sciences (Social Sciences) and Neurobiology and Behavior (Biological Sciences) are one example; another example is Philosophy (Humanities) and Logic and Philosophy of Science (Social Science), which both award graduate degrees in Philosophy.

Special considerations are also necessary in the case of intercampus programs, such as the Tri-Campus PhD program in Classics (UCI, UCSD, and UC Riverside) or the PhD program in Drama (UCI and UCSD). 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, can easily 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 APRS.

## **IV. REVIEW PROCESS**

### **A. Schedule of Reviews**

The 2005 Special Committee proposes that the next review cycle stretch to a ten-year period to reduce the annual budget and workload. The proposed schedule of reviews is provided in Attachment 1.

### **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 Executive Vice Chancellor occur within a reasonable timeframe which ensures that the information remains timely and actionable. A sample timeline is provided here (Attachment 2).

### **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 APRS for consideration, and in practice these are rarely granted.

### **D. Data Collection**

#### **1. Self-Study Questions**

In preparation for a review, the APRO 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 APRS 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 APRS and the APRO 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.

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. 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 those portions of the dean's response which relate 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.

Based on the APRS's internal review (see section F-2, below), 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.

The set of self study questions and data tables (see below) for Departments and Schools is included in Attachments 3-4. The Faculty Biosketch form is included in Attachment 5.

## 2. Data Tables

Much of the necessary statistical information can and should be obtained from the UCI Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management (OASIM), and it should be part of the responsibility of the APRO to assemble those items that can be produced routinely by OASIM. This will also help reduce the burden on units under review.

## 3. Surveys

Surveys are administered by the APRO, but correspondence about changes to their design or analysis of results is generally undertaken directly with either the CEP or GC.

As of October 2003, the Undergraduate and Graduate surveys are administered by the Senate Office using the online survey software Zoomerang. The Faculty Survey is a form sent out to all Senate Faculty by e-mail. Past efforts have yielded very poor return rate on alumni surveys; at one point the APRS discussed using the RGS exit survey, but the available numbers are so small as to be insignificant. Post-doctoral surveys are conducted if there is a substantial postdoctoral presence in the unit being reviewed.

## 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 APRS 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 can be contained in a single loose leaf notebook, the "review notebook". It will be the responsibility of the APRO to solicit this information from the appropriate sources and assemble the notebook in a standardized format with two sided pages. The Notebook 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 the past five years, every ERC has in fact requested a copy of the last review.

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

Based on department size and student enrollments, most Departmental ERCs will have two or three members, all of whom will be asked to review the unit as a whole and will not be assigned to concentrate individually on graduate or undergraduate aspects. A schoolwide ERC should be composed of a subset of the departmental reviewers or conducted solely by the ERC Chair, as appropriate.

The APRS will select members of the ERC from a slate of nominees developed by the APRS. This slate will be constructed by asking each unit under review to submit a list of knowledgeable nominators who could recommend potential reviewers. The APRS and/or the EVC 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 APRS will consider the nominations, construct a list of suitable reviewers in priority order, and direct assign various members of the APRS to contact the potential reviewers to secure their agreement to serve. The APRS 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 APRS 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, 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 APRS to recommend persons who can nominate experienced and disinterested reviewers, but units will not be asked to recommend their own reviewers. 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 two or 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 two and one-half to three days, in keeping with current practice. A school-wide review should be conducted by a subset of department reviewers, or solely by the Chair. All ERC committee members will participate in reviewing the entire academic program of the unit under review. To ensure that all aspects of the academic program are scrutinized by a panel of reviewers, reviewers will not be assigned separately to the undergraduate and graduate portions of the program. The scope of the school-wide review should include the dean's strategic plan for academic development and the administrative structure of the school.

## 2. Conflict of Interest Considerations

The APRS 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 APRS 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

APRS 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 National Science Foundation document "Conflicts of Interest and Standards of Ethical Conduct, November 2003", available through the APRO.

## **F. Charge to the Extramural Review Committee (ERC)**

### 1. Standard Charge

ERCs are given standard charges (Attachments 6-7): one for the Schoolwide review and one for the Departments to be reviewed. All members of the ERC will be asked to examine the full academic program of the unit under review so as to achieve a balanced review of all aspects of the program. The School's Administration is also an important aspect of the review. We should rely on the expertise and wisdom of well chosen committees to respond to this charge in a way that reflects the special circumstances that may exist in the units under review.

## 2. Internal Review and Specific Charge

The APRS shall conduct an internal review, the primary focus of which is to create a specific charge which shall be coordinated with CEP and GC. The APRS 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 APRS is responsible for revising these Charges as dictated by its own experience and as directed by the CEP and GC.

Some special considerations for the internal review might include the existence of any Interdisciplinary, cross-Departmental, cross-School or Inter-Campus programs, as discussed in Section III-C, above.

## 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 APRS 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 APRO 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 local issues, e.g. the UCI campus administrative structure, that may not be apparent from the material gathered in the Review Notebook. The APRS 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 APRS, 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 APRS, Undergraduate and Graduate Deans

### 3. Components of a Schoolwide Review visit

Instead of meeting with individual Department Chairs, faculty, and students, Schoolwide reviewers meet with the following, in addition to the orientation and exit meetings described above:

- 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 APRS.

## **H. Receipt of Report**

### 1. Distribution

Upon receipt of the external report, the APRS 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 APRS will also forward the report to the EVC, with a description of the Senate's subsequent steps. After the report's initial distribution, the 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. Transmission to Executive Vice Chancellor and 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 Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), with a request to make the report available 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 EVC will be shared with the Council on Research, Computing and Library Resources (CORCLR) 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 (submission of all relevant reports to the EVC), the APRS will ask the chair of the department in question, and the dean of the corresponding school, to describe the actions taken by the department and school in response to the most recent academic program review. These responses will be forwarded by the APRS 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 EVC, CORCLR, and CPB along with any commentary that the respective councils may wish to attach.

### **J. Closure of Review**

Transmittal to the EVC 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 8). 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 9). It outlines the phases of a review and describes the types of documents generated and distributed.

Under this policy, survey results are considered “working documents”. As such, they are permanently destroyed upon closure of the review, along with the other self-study materials.

Joint Review of Academic Programs  
Description and Procedures  
May 2005

List of Attachments

Attachment 1	Schedule of Reviews through 2008
Attachment 2	Sample Timeline
Attachment 3	Self-Study Questions for Departments + Data Tables
Attachment 4	Self-Study Questions for Schools + Data Tables
Attachment 5	Faculty Biosketch form
Attachment 6	Charge to External Reviewers: Department Review
Attachment 7	Charge to External Reviewers: School Review
Attachment 8	General Statement on Confidentiality, August 8, 2000
Attachment 9	UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of Academic Program Review Documents, November 21, 2000