

## ACADEMIC SENATE GUIDELINES FOR THE SELF-REVIEW (Revised June 2007)

### 1. Introduction

The Academic Senate has scheduled this year as the time for you to prepare a self-review of your academic program. A thoughtful and thorough self-evaluation, developed with the participation of as many of your faculty, staff, and students as possible, can provide the basis for planning to develop and maintain excellence in your program. The self-review is the first and, in many ways, the most important step in the Academic Senate mandated Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council reviews on campus. Next year a review team will conduct a site visit of your program and prepare a report and recommendations. The self-review report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the site visit interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. Thus, your own presentation of your program will be available to everyone who receives the review report and recommendations.

This guide indicates typical self-review activities and report items that the review team and the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils are interested in as a description of your program. The hope is that the self-review will not be overly burdensome and that the work will prove useful to your program. Your efforts should be focused first on a dialog among the faculty, with input from students and staff, to determine the status of your program, your goals for it, and how to achieve them. The only purpose of the written self-review report is to give the review team an accurate picture of your current activities and plans for the future.

Section 4 below describes the organization and items of the self-review report. You may wish to add to these items or delete some, if not appropriate. The content of the report should be descriptive and analytic, providing evidence and support for assertions as appropriate. It should certainly highlight strengths and achievements of your program and your future plans for it. However, it should not avoid problems or weaknesses. No one likes to admit problems, but it is unlikely they will remain hidden from the review team. A program that is demonstrably aware of problems and trying to do something about them is in better shape than a program that is either unaware of problems or uninvolved in coping with them. The self-review report should require only a relatively modest amount of time to prepare. It should be concise; a rough guide is 5-10 single-spaced pages for small and medium size programs and 10-15, for large programs. We are sending you as much relevant institutional and Senate data as available.

With the transmittal of your self-review report, you should include **two copies** of a CV for each ladder faculty member. These CVs should not be part of the self-review report, but rather should be bundled together as a separate submittal. A short (two or so pages) CV is preferred, but you should submit whatever each faculty member has readily available. Do not create a new one. It is not necessary that these CVs be in a common format.

### 2. Information Provided to You

We are sending several things with these Guidelines for the Self-Review: various institutional and Senate data (see Section 4G and list at end), the review report and recommendations from your last review, and the follow-up or closure report from that review. Be sure to familiarize your faculty, students, and staff with the materials from the previous review (see Section 4G). One matter for the review team and the Councils will be a comparison of the status of your program now and then; another will be the extent to which recommendations from the previous review were implemented in the intervening period. Use of the institutional and Senate data was discussed in Section 1 and will be discussed again in Section 4J.

### 3. Self-Review Activities

An essential element in the self-review is the informed dialogue of faculty, students, and staff about the program -- what it is now, what works well and how to sustain it, what needs improvement and how to achieve it, and future goals and aspirations and how to achieve them. Early in the self-review year you should hold as many meetings as needed to provide the basic content for the self-review report. Organize them in ways that best suit your program. Once the self-review report has been drafted, it is worthwhile to have one or more meetings to discuss it.

### 4. Sections of the Self-Review Report

**A. Introduction.** You should begin your self-review with a few paragraphs of summary of the consultation, preparation, and review process used in the construction of the self-review document. What was the involvement of faculty, students, and staff in this process? What meetings were held, what surveys were conducted, who prepared the document, who reviewed the final product, etc.? A faculty vote is required on the final draft of the self-review report with the vote tally clearly stated. The results of the vote must include the number of eligible voters.

**B. General Information.** In this section, you should provide an overview of your academic program, in a general way that encompasses both undergraduate and graduate education in your unit, as applicable. Please keep in mind that some members of the review team may not be familiar with either your unit or your discipline. You might begin by providing a brief introduction to your program, department, or unit, so that a non-specialist can obtain an idea of what you are trying to accomplish as an educational unit. As appropriate, give specific data about your program, referring to the institutional and Senate data we have provided whenever possible. The self review should include a data summary reporting number of faculty, faculty rank, number of graduate and undergraduate students in the various programs, etc. This overview section should include appropriate academic items, such as the size and diversity of the faculty, as well as your academic staffing priorities for the future, and your use of non-ladder faculty. It should also briefly address non-academic support items, including the number and type of administrative and service staff, and their effectiveness in furthering your academic mission. You must include your outreach and recruitment efforts to maintain student and faculty diversity, especially as UCLA has adopted a diversity statement. You should introduce the review team to the research of your faculty, commenting on major research thrusts, areas where you are particularly strong, areas that need to be strengthened, and current research support as well as other possibilities for support. Faculty teaching activities may be discussed, including such items as formal classroom teaching, seminars, advising, thesis/dissertation supervision, teaching load, and evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Describe your current activities, accomplishments and future plans to foster faculty equity with regard to gender and ethnicity in the areas of hiring, advancement, retention, and workload distribution (e.g., teaching, service, and administration). You should comment on the resources (see 4H below) available to your unit. A brief discussion concerning the physical plant available to your program might also be included. This would include a statement concerning the adequacy of faculty, staff, and student office space, equipment, laboratories, computers, etc. available to your program.

**C. Bylaws.** Provide a current copy of your departmental/program bylaws. If your unit currently has no bylaws, University policy requires that you establish bylaws and submit them to the appropriate Academic Senate Council for review. Bylaws must be approved by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. The Self-Review must include this section.

**D. Undergraduate Programs.** In this section, provide an overview of the goals, rationale, and structure of your undergraduate educational programs, providing evidence and support as appropriate. The evaluation of the undergraduate program should be given equal emphasis to that of the graduate program. In the broad sense, this should basically be constructed along the following lines: What is it that you currently do, what do you do well, what areas need to be

strengthened, and where do you see yourself going in the future vis-a-vis undergraduate education? Some of the details you may want to include are your program's objectives for undergraduate education, how they mesh with your students' interests and needs, and how you compare to other similar programs, departments, or units within UCLA and in your discipline at other universities. Also include an assessment of the number of majors engaged in the honors program and the existence of research opportunities or a seminar series for undergraduates. You should also articulate how your goals for undergraduate education are currently being implemented, and any plans you are considering for changes.

When units under review have minors affiliated with their programs, these minors should be evaluated. Similarly, honors programs and General Education courses offered by the unit should also be examined for quality.

**E. Graduate Programs.** Just as in the undergraduate section, you should provide here a summary of the goals, rationale, and structure of your graduate degree programs, namely: What is it that you currently do, what do you do well, what areas need to be strengthened, and where do you see yourself going in the future? One of the items you may feel important to include might be your objectives for graduate education, how they compare with other similar units in UCLA and in your discipline at other universities, and your successes and failures in achieving them. You might also want to discuss your applicant pool, career goals and opportunities for graduates, the intrinsic importance of your fields of study, and the prospects for intramural and extramural funding. **You must also include a description of your admissions process as required by the Graduate Council Policies and Procedures Governing Graduate Admissions.** Other possible items for inclusion are enrollment by specialty, recruitment of graduate students, student diversity, attrition and time-to-degree, academic advising, graduate student participation in departmental or unit affairs, career guidance, and student financial support.

**F. Report on Articulated, Concurrent, and Self-Supporting Programs.** As in the case of reporting on undergraduate and graduate programs, departments should provide a full report on all articulated, concurrent and self-supporting programs. Describe the program, the number of students, etc, as described in D and E above.

**G. Comparison to the Previous Review.** In this section, you should identify how your program now compares to the program at the time of the previous review. When there are continuing important strengths or weaknesses, analyze their causes and, for weaknesses, suggest how to remedy them. If the previously recommended approaches to addressing these weaknesses did not work, suggest why. If they were not tried, explain why. When there have been changes from then to now for better (or worse), analyze their causes and, as needed, suggest a future course of action. This section should be short, addressing important strengths and weaknesses, not necessarily covering every recommendation from the previous review.

**H. Resources.** You should comment on the resources available to your unit to help you fulfill your research and teaching responsibilities. Appropriate items here might include the general departmental or unit operational budget and all instructional assistance support (TAs, RAs, fellowships, scholarships). In order to facilitate the review of the Academic Senate Council on Planning and Budget, a template to specifically address resources has been approved by the Councils, available at: <http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/CPBtemplate.doc>. This information may be provided as an appendix to the self-review.

**I. Special Circumstances.** In this section, you should feel free to articulate anything else you feel is appropriate and important for the review team to know. For example, you might want to discuss your department's or unit's participation in interdepartmental degree programs, any particular successes or problems you have had in dealing with the administration above your department or unit or with the Academic Senate, any special circumstances associated with

professional degree programs, or how budget cuts have affected your teaching and research. Any comments you might have on the statistical data supplied to you (see Section 4G) could be added here if they have not been made earlier. In short, this last section is a catch-all for any information you feel doesn't fit in the earlier sections, but nonetheless is important background for the review team to have.

**J. Appendices.** Various institutional and Senate data summaries are being sent with this self-review guide (see attached list). All these materials should be appended to your self-review report narrative. If you feel these data are correct and self-explanatory, there is no need for you to discuss them in narrative form in your self-review report. However, you should feel free to comment on these data if you feel such comment is necessary to portray an accurate picture of your program. The data should nonetheless be appended. In addition, append any other material you believe it is imperative for the reviewers to receive.

## **5. Submission of the Self-Review**

The self-review is normally due by the end of Spring Quarter of the self-review year or, at the latest, the beginning of Fall Quarter of the site visit year. It should be in two parts: (1) the self-review report narrative and appendices containing all the institutional and Senate data sent to you and any other material you choose to append and (2) two copies of the CV for each faculty member. The letter informing you of the self-review will have specified the number of copies of the items in #1 and the due date.

## GUIDELINES FOR THE SELF-REVIEW

### Institutional and Senate Data Summaries for the Self-Review

Institutional and Senate data have always been part of the academic program review process. Beginning in 1996-97, the Senate is increasing its efforts to provide helpful data in user friendly formats. Much of this work is being done in cooperation with the Office of Academic Planning and Budget, the Graduate Division, and the Office of the Provost for Undergraduate Education. The goal is to reduce the workload in the program review process, particularly for the units whose programs are under review. Providing institutional and Senate data removes the need for anyone associated with the program review process to create such data. Providing it in useful formats allows reports simply to refer to it (and append it) rather than incorporate it into the body of a report. We expect the number of data summaries to grow and their formats to change in the next several years. Consequently, this part of the self-review guide is likely to change from year to year.

#### Data Summaries Available and Sent with These Guidelines

##### MP Table with Workload Measures and Ratios

Enrollment information, Student Credit Hours, and Instructional Staff and Degrees. Unweighted and Weighted Student FTE per Faculty FTE and Degrees per FTE.

Prepared by the **Office of Analysis & Information Management (AIM)**:

<http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp>

##### Class Report

Includes—by level of student—the total count of the number of students enrolled in primary sections (including M-courses and C-courses), i.e. lecture sections as opposed to labs or quiz sections.

Prepared by the **Office of Analysis and Information Management**:

<http://www.aim.ucla.edu/classreports/classreports.asp>

##### Undergraduate Council Academic Program Review Summary

Instructional Offerings, Instructional Resources, and Faculty Engagement; Undergraduate Student Characteristics and Academic Outcomes

Prepared by the **Academic Planning & Budget Office**:

<http://www.aim.ucla.edu/aprs/apbaprs.asp>

##### Performance Indicators on Graduate Education

Performance indicators in the following seven section areas: Program Profile; Undergraduate Institutions of Entering Graduate Students; Merit Based Support to Graduate Students; Graduate Council Survey Reports (quantitative data, summary graphs, scholarly activities); Doctoral Recipient Exit Survey (quantitative data, summary graphs, scholarly activities); Doctoral Degrees Awarded and Dissertation Titles; Doctoral Job Placements.

Prepared by the **Graduate Division** office: <http://www.gdnet.ucla.edu/>

##### Faculty Diversity Monograph (enclosed)

Prepared by the **Office of Faculty Diversity and Development**. Faculty include those from the general campus, the health sciences and the professional schools:

<http://www.faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/library/data/index.htm#mnggrph>

*Click on Diversity Statistics Regular Rank Faculty 2008-2009.*

##### Council on Planning and Budget Template

Prepared by the **Academic Senate** Council on Planning and Budget

<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreviews/documents/CPBtemplate.doc>

Graduate Division Issues Statement

Prepared by the **Graduate Division** office: To be distributed prior to the site visit

Undergraduate Education Issues Statement

Prepared by the **Division of Undergraduate Education**: To be distributed prior to the site visit

Council on Planning & Budget Issues Statement

Prepared by the **Academic Senate** Office: To be distributed prior to the site visit

Undergraduate Student Survey

Prepared by the **Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER)**: In consultation with the UGC, OUER will conduct a survey of undergraduate students. Results to be distributed prior to the site visit.

Previous Graduate Council/Undergraduate Council review reports

Prepared by the **Academic Senate** Office: Documents enclosed

The department is not required to submit the following in advance (unless requested) but should be prepared to make the following documents available during the site visit:

Awards Transactions (List of contracts and grants where departmental/unit faculty is PI)

Strategic Planning documents (if available)

Teaching Evaluations (Summary pages for required courses)

Current General Catalog Copy of Course Offerings and Program Degree Requirements

Brochures for Outreach and Recruitment for Undergraduate and Graduate Students

*Please note that additional information may be requested at the time of the pre-site meeting.*

---

*The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils approved the following documents to assist review teams in assessing the quality of the educational program:*

Excellence in Graduate Education

Prepared by the **Academic Senate** office:

<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreviews/process0203/Excellence.htm>

Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities

Prepared by UCLA **Graduate Students Association**:

<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/StudentRightsResponsibilities.pdf>

Guidelines for the Graduate Admissions Process and Codification of the Policies and Procedures Governing Graduate Admissions

Prepared by the **Graduate Division** office:

<http://www.gdnet.ucla.edu/gasaa/library/gccodific.pdf>

Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Prepared by the **Academic Senate** office:

[http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committee/JGC/Documents/excellence\\_in\\_undergraduate\\_educ.htm](http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committee/JGC/Documents/excellence_in_undergraduate_educ.htm)