

ACADEMIC SENATE GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS (Revised October 2001)

SUBMISSION OF REPORTS: External Reviewers will submit individual reports to the Academic Senate Office **only** (not to faculty in departments or programs) two weeks after their on-site visit (Academic Senate Office, University of California, 405 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90095-1408). These reports will be utilized by the Senate review teams in conjunction with other materials to generate a final, single Review Report. These reports are carefully scrutinized by the appropriate committees prior to approval and adoption by the Senate. The External Reviewers' reports will be available to be read by members of the reviewing agencies of the Senate and will be included in the final report transmitted to the department or interdepartmental program, the Dean and the Chancellor's Office. These reports are made available to all faculty and students in the department or program after completion of the review process.

GENERAL TOPICS: In general, we are interested in your overall assessment of the research and teaching accomplishments and potential of the unit you are reviewing. The charge to the consultant is to evaluate the educational programs as well as to make an explicit comparison of the UCLA program with comparable programs in other major universities. The Councils are most interested in your expertise in assessing the quality of both the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs. Recommendations to increase resources may follow from this, but are not in themselves the primary responsibility of the reviewers.

It might be helpful to think of your review with the following questions in mind:

1. For the graduate program, have you suggested that your own undergraduates apply here? For which of your undergraduates, if any, would you recommend the UCLA program?
2. In many fields, long-range planning and strategic choices about areas of teaching and research are necessary. Do you believe that this unit has an imaginative, workable long-range plan that will allow it to make major contributions to the discipline and to pursue appropriate specializations with distinction?
3. How well does this unit teach its undergraduates? Would you want some of these students in your own graduate program? What about the courses for non-majors? Does the unit pay enough attention to its undergraduates in the areas of teaching, counseling, and introduction to research?
4. Do the current administrative structures at UCLA make sense for fostering the research and teaching in the field that you are reviewing? Are there closely related units at UCLA or other University of California campuses where more collaboration should be undertaken? Are there appropriate support facilities such as libraries, research and teaching space, and computer labs and training? If this is an Interdepartmental Program, should we continue to separate the program from its affiliated Organized Research Unit?
5. Are there ways to resolve problems or improve the program under review that do not include additional full-time faculty and/or other resources?

We are aware that each department/program under review presents a special set of circumstances and that your review will need to take these distinctions into account. We intend these guidelines to be suggested topics that you may want to pursue rather than prescriptions of the process. As an External Reviewer, you should feel entirely free to pursue whatever avenues of investigation will yield constructive and relevant insights into the particular programs. We hope to obtain well thought-out and forthright judgments of where we stand in the academic picture, so that UCLA may best capitalize on its strengths and take effective steps to correct weaknesses. The Academic Senate will give serious consideration to whatever directions you believe to be most worthwhile in achieving those ends.