

**ACADEMIC SENATE GUIDELINES FOR THE REPORT
OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM AS CHARGED BY
THE GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE COUNCILS (GC AND UGC)
(Revised June 2007)**

This is a guide to the writing of an Academic Program Review Team's report. The Chair of the Review Team bears final responsibility for preparing the team's report, which is due within four academic weeks after the site visit. The report should integrate into one document the following perspectives: GC and UgC Review Team members' findings, the observations of external scholars (who will each submit individual reports, to be attached to the final Review Team Report, within two academic weeks of the site visit), and the unit's self-review narrative (which shall be attached).

The Review Team Report should be a concise document: 5-7 pages (single-spaced) for small programs and 8-10 pages for large ones. The Review Team Report should refer the reader to the unit's self-review report and its addenda for non-disputed information; any material from the self-review report with which the Review Team disagrees should be discussed at relevant points in the Review Team Report. The Review Team Report should also refer to the individual reports of the external scholars as recognized authorities in the discipline.

The document should summarize non-disputed descriptive statements (e.g., numbers of majors, ranking in field, types of courses offered, placement of graduates) found in the unit's self-review report, its addenda, or the external reviewers' reports. The findings of the report should include:

1. introductory statement including a general overview of the program (administrative structure, degree programs, number of students, etc.) and a summary of the participants and activities related to the preparation of the report.
2. strengths and achievements of the program(s) under review;
3. goals and plans for the program(s); and
4. areas in need of attention, with prioritized recommendations and a rationale for each one.

These areas are outlined below:

In section #2, Strengths and Achievements, the Review Team Report should note areas of excellence in the unit's academic programs. On scholarly matters, the Report should rely heavily upon the judgments of the external reviewers. On matters of curriculum and administration, the Review Team as a whole should agree on any areas in which the unit has demonstrated strength and achievement. Any specific recommendations related to the strengths and achievements should be placed in the third section of the report.

In section #3, Goals and Plans, the Review Team Report should describe and comment on the unit's vision of its future. If the unit's plans and goals for its academic programs are not clearly presented elsewhere, then a brief summary should be provided, based both on the self-review report and the site visit. The Review Team Report should provide a brief evaluation of the reasoning behind, the desirability of, and the feasibility of such plans and goals. Any specific recommendations related to goals and plans should be placed in the third section of the report.

In section #4, Areas in Need of Attention, the Review Team Report should provide a list of recommendations, in descending order of priority, and an explanation of the reasoning behind each of them, referring as appropriate to the reports of the external reviewers. The recommendations should address any aspects of the academic program that need attention and any goals that may need to be re-examined or re-focused. Recommendations may refer to a wide array of issues concerning scholarship, curriculum, numbers of majors, non-majors, or graduate students, administration, grading practices, staff support, student morale, physical

plant, and so forth -- in short, any matter that affects the unit's ability to offer excellent degree programs.

To the extent possible, each recommendation should be addressed to a person(s) or office(s) on campus most responsible for addressing the Review Team's concerns, including the unit itself, the responsible academic dean, the provost, other unit chairs, administrators in the libraries, building maintenance, the registrar's office, and so forth.

After each numbered recommendation, a concise (one-paragraph) explanation of the Review Team's reasoning should appear. This rationale should clarify only the facts and logic behind the recommendation, drawing as appropriate on the external reviewers' findings; it should not include summaries of the program's history or practice, or disputes internal to the unit, already noted in the unit's self-review report. As described in section 6 of the "Guidelines for Site Visit", the Review Team Report should reflect the team's considered judgment about matters of evidence, confidentiality, and purview of the academic program review process.

The list of recommendations should express, as far as possible, the collective opinion of the full Review Team, including the opinions of the external reviewers. When the external review team is remiss in not performing sufficient evaluation or in failing to address some area, it is then appropriate for the internal review team to add its own analysis and/or recommendations. If there is disagreement between review team members about a recommendation or its priority, the disagreement should be explained in the recommendation's rationale, giving the arguments pro and con the different recommendations or priorities.

N.B. Section #3 should consist of the recommendations and integrated rationales only. This section is part of the Review Team Report and should not constitute a separate document. The review team's draft recommendations will continue to be advisory to GC and UgC, which will revise them as the full membership deems and ultimately vote to approve them. These final, approved recommendations and their rationales will be section #3 of the Report. Please limit the number of recommendations to ten, if possible. Excessive recommendations diminish the importance of the essential improvements required to maintain or improve the quality of the program(s) under review.

The document that the Review Team Chair submits to either or both UgC and GC, depending on what academic programs are involved, should contain the following materials:

1. Title Page -- identifying programs reviewed, unit offering them, site visit dates, review team members and affiliations, and review team chair, date of report, final approval date, and list of appendices.
2. Review Team Report Narrative:
 - Introduction: Overview of the unit, list of the participants, summary of meetings, and other information used for preparation of the report.
 - Strengths and Achievements
 - Goals and Plans
 - Areas in Need of Attention
3. Reports from the External Reviewers
4. Site Visit Schedule, with notations of changes, additions, etc.
5. Self-Review

The Review Team Report and draft recommendations will be reviewed by GC and UgC. Revisions will be made as needed to obtain GC and UgC approval. Once all necessary changes have been made to items #1 and #2, all the elements identified in #1-5 above constitute the final review report and recommendations and are sent to the unit chair, dean, and others. Together with the unit chair's, dean's, and others' responses, they serve as the basis for the Progress Review Meeting.

Guidelines for the Graduate Council/Undergraduate Council Review Report

In order to facilitate processing of the Academic Senate review report, please follow the general guidelines for the format and preparation of the review report.

Must have the following formatting:	Must have the following sections:
Spacing - single line paragraphs	Cover page and appendices: See example.
Font – Tahoma 10 or 11 point or Times New Roman 12 point	Title page: 20XX-XX Academic Senate Review of the Department of XXX
Bolds - emphasis of paragraph titles or headings	Introduction: Summary paragraph describing preparation of the report including self review report, site visit interviews, follow-up interviews.
Italics – publication titles (please do not underline)	Strengths and achievements: Sections on the faculty, student body, curriculum, research programs, and evaluation of the strengths and achievements as noted in Self Review and the site visit. Describe the areas that need improvement, and possible solutions. Include number of students and faculty and any other statistical information that describe the department.
Margins set at 1" (top, bottom, left and right sides) Justification – left	Goals and Plans: Long range planning for faculty recruitment, research development, course and program changes, student outreach, physical plant, staff resources, and equipment needs.
Page numbering: beginning on first page of report (not cover page)	Summary statement: Overall opinion of the department.
Headers or footers: name of department, e.g., XXXX-XX English Review Report	Prioritized Recommendations: Recommendations should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Addressed to Administration (Academic Dean, Chancellor, EVC) or Department (Chair, Faculty) or both Administration/Department. ● Identified as essential or significant for the Administration/Department to resolve to maintain quality of the program. ● Referenced with the external and internal reviewers' reports and page numbers that support the recommendation. ● Followed by one-paragraph explanation of the Review Team's reasoning for the recommendation. ● Limited to a reasonable number of recommendations. ● Final Recommendation: The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils recommend the next review be scheduled for AY 20XX-XX pending a satisfactory progress review report. Alternatively, recommendation may be an internal review to be scheduled.
Spelling and grammar checked (Please make sure if you are importing a document from email that you have checked all the formatting and made the necessary corrections)	
Programs – Microsoft Word, or Excel if you have tables is preferred.	
Email documents to the Undergraduate and Graduate Council Analysts. Judith Lacertosa: jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu Kyle Cunningham: kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu	Committee signature – All reports must have each internal review team members' name, department, Council affiliation, Chair designation, in alphabetical order (title case), and the date of the draft report.

These are general guidelines that can be adapted to the specific needs of the department/program under review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Linda Mohr, 310-206-2470.