



**Academic Senate Program Review Process
Manual 2009-2010**

**Academic Senate
Los Angeles Division**

ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Table of Contents

	Page Number
Appendix XVI: Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council Procedures for Academic Program Reviews	1
Guidelines for the Self Review	6
Guidelines for the Letter of Departmental Commitment to IDP	12
Guidelines for the Site Visit	13
Guidelines for External Reviewers	21
Guidelines for the Report of an Academic Program Charged by GC/UGC	22
Guidelines for Preparation of the Academic Senate Review Report	24
Guidelines for Progress Review	25
Academic Senate Program Review Staff	28

Program Review Policy & Procedures are posted on the Academic Senate Website:
<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/procedures.htm>

**APPENDIX XVI: GRADUATE COUNCIL AND UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL PROCEDURES
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS
[En 11 June 91; Repealed 9 Nov 94; En 12 Nov 96; En Nov 01; Am 1 Nov 07]**

For the information of campus and extramural agencies concerned with the Academic Senate's review of academic programs, this appendix outlines goals and procedures for such reviews in accordance with the charges of the Graduate Council (GC) and Undergraduate Council (UgC) set forth in Senate Bylaws 65.2 and 65.1 respectively.

GOALS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Academic Program Review Goals

The primary goal of the Academic Program Reviews is to maintain and strengthen the quality of UCLA's undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Reviews are intended to be helpful and supportive in (a) recognizing strengths and achievements, (b) promoting goal setting and planning, and (c) identifying areas in need of attention. Reviews should primarily seek perspectives useful to the units whose programs are under review and to their respective academic deans. They should also give Senate agencies and senior administrators an informed overview of the strengths, problems, and needs of academic units.

2. Councils' Responsibility for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

UgC is responsible for all undergraduate degree programs including undergraduate minors and honors programs; GC is responsible for all graduate degree programs. When a department, interdepartmental degree program (IDP), center for interdisciplinary instruction (CII), or other academic unit (all hereafter referred to as units) offers only undergraduate or graduate degree(s), then the responsible Council alone carries out all aspects of the review. When the unit offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees, then the UgC and GC carry out all aspects of the review together. In any given year, the Councils will split between them leadership in these joint reviews. What follows is written as though the unit offered both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

SELF-REVIEW

3. Self-review by the Unit

UgC and GC shall notify each unit to be reviewed in the Fall Quarter of the academic year prior to the site visit, requesting the unit to undertake a self-review that includes not only its present situation but also its plans and expectations. At this time, UgC and GC shall identify the information required to prepare the self-review, provide the unit with statistical information from either Senate or administration sources, and stipulate when any further information will be made available to the unit. All this information shall become part of the self-review. In preparing the self-review, the unit's faculty and students shall engage in one or more discussions of programs, strengths, weaknesses, and goals, organizing the discussions however the faculty and students prefer. The self-review shall be a concise document. The faculty should vote on the final draft and report the vote tally. The results of the vote must include the number of eligible voters. The self-review shall be submitted to Councils via the Program Review Director no later than the first week of Fall Quarter of the academic year during which the site visit will take place.

REVIEW TEAM

4. Advice on Review Team Members and Schedule

UgC and GC shall seek advice concerning both UCLA and external scholars who could serve as internal or external reviewers and the duration and organization of the site visit. Advice shall be

sought from Senate members of the unit to be reviewed, from other appropriate Senate sources, and from relevant academic administrators. The list of external scholars obtained in this way shall be forwarded to the administrative officer (e.g., Dean) of the unit under review, who should comment on the list and may add names. UgC and GC rosters shall be made available to those from whom advice is sought. UgC and GC may also make use of non-confidential information from the Committee on Academic Personnel database used to nominate ad hoc committees for academic personnel reviews.

5. Review Team

The immediately incoming and immediately outgoing UgC and GC Chairs (ordinarily a total of 4 people) shall select the members of each program review team, considering the advice they have received. The Chairs' selections shall be subject to ratification by the UgC and GC. The review team will ordinarily consist of two UgC members, two GC members, and two external scholars. However, the composition is flexible. For small units, as few as one UgC member, one GC member, and one external scholar are acceptable; for large units, more than two external scholars may be needed. If only one GC or UgC member is assigned, an alternate may be designated. As an exception, one of the two designated UgC or two designated GC members may be a previous member of the Council experienced in program reviews but not at present serving on either Council. The decision is made by the UgC and GC Chairs after consultation with the unit chair and dean.

SITE VISIT

6. Site Visit Structure

The immediately incoming and immediately outgoing UgC and GC Chairs (ordinarily a total of 4 people) shall establish the basic structure of the site visit, considering the advice they have received. Ordinarily, the site visit will last two days. For small units, it may be shorter; for large units, longer. Ordinarily, the review team will work as one group. However, for large units and/or longer site visits, the team may divide up at certain times.

7. Issues for the Review

Prior to the site visit, UgC and GC will invite the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), relevant academic administrators, and the unit chair, to inform UgC and GC of issues they feel are important to the review, including issues raised in previous reviews. The unit's self-review will be available to them.

8. Information for the Review Team

Prior to the site visit, review team members shall receive a copy of this appendix, the self-review, the memorandum of progress from the previous review, the graduate and undergraduate statistical data sheets, any surveys, the most recent strategic plan of the relevant division or school, and any letters identifying important issues for the review (see 7). The external reviewers shall have the opportunity to prepare a concise written preliminary evaluation of the degree programs and issues that should be pursued during the site visit and to make this statement available when the review team first meets.

9. Site Visit Schedule

Each review team shall conduct its site visit at UCLA. The schedule for the site visit shall be established by the unit chair and review team chair. However, it is understood that the review team may elect to change the schedule at any time during the site visit. The following elements shall be part of each site visit: private time each day for the review team to discuss its work; private meetings with the unit chair, and academic dean, individual or group meetings with a representative sample of faculty; individual or group meetings with representative samples of students in each degree program under review; open time for faculty and students to sign up for

individual or group meetings (as they choose); and unscheduled time in the latter part of the site visit when the review team may meet with whomever it wishes.

10. UgC and GC Student Representatives

Graduate student representatives serving on the UgC and GC shall have access to the following review materials: self-review, internal reviews, external reviews, student surveys, and statistical information. Graduate students may join review teams when the teams meet with students in the unit under review. Students in the unit under review will be informed that they may contact the UgC and GC student representatives and organizations before or after this meeting, especially about sensitive topics. The GSA representatives to UgC and GC may summarize these comments for the review team. These UgC and GC student representatives are also invited to participate in all UgC and GC discussions about student input in the review and the review report unless they are in the department under review.

REVIEW REPORT

11. Review Team Report

The purpose of the review report is a candid, thoughtful, objective appraisal of the unit under review. The review report should incorporate the opinions of both the external and internal reviewers. The chair of the review team shall be responsible for the final review report, which is due within four (academic session) weeks after the site visit. The external reviewers shall each submit an individual report within two (academic session) weeks after the site visit. The review report shall be a concise document. It shall (a) present the strengths and achievements of the unit, (b) comment on the unit's plans and goals, and (c) provide a prioritized set of recommendations, with brief rationales, for how to address any areas needing attention. The list of recommendations should address critical issues, and to the extent possible, the report shall integrate the UgC and GC perspectives into one narrative and the UgC and GC recommendations into one set. The review report shall include the data summary. The review report shall have appended to it the unit's self-review narrative and the reports of the external reviewers.

12. Report Review and Distribution

After preliminary approval by the UgC and GC Administrative Committee, the draft of the complete report (which includes but is not limited to draft recommendations, external reviewers' reports, and the self-review narrative) shall be sent to the unit chair who will review it for errors of fact and errors of omission and respond within one (academic session) week. The unit will have the opportunity to respond to substantial issues after receiving the final report.

The final report, corrected as needed, and with the approved recommendations, shall be sent to appropriate administrators, the unit chair, the chair of the relevant Faculty Executive Committee, and CPB.

13. The Progress Review Report

The unit chair and academic dean shall submit written statements which include descriptions of actions planned and already taken in response to the review. These statements (which constitute the Progress Review Report) shall be submitted to UgC and GC no later than eleven months after the review report is distributed by UgC and GC.

14. Follow-up to the Progress Review Report

The Progress Review Report will be reviewed by the Review Team Chair who will provide a summary to the Councils. The Review Team Chair will recommend to the Councils one of the following:

- a) The progress review meeting (see below) should be waived and closure is recommended for the Councils' approval. If so approved, the Review Team Chair's summary will serve as the closure report (see 15 below).
- b) A progress review meeting should be scheduled. Closure of the review and the next review date will be determined as a result of that meeting, subject to approval by Councils. The Memorandum of Progress/Closure Report will be recommended for Councils' approval after the progress review meeting.
- c) The progress review meeting should be postponed pending an internal site visit, subject to the approval of the Councils.

If the Progress Review Meeting is held, it shall be scheduled one year to eighteen months after the site visit. The UgC and GC invite attendees. They shall include the relevant dean and unit chair and the chairs of GC and UgC or their representatives. Participants at the Progress Review Meeting shall discuss the review findings and recommendations and the Progress Review Report.

15. Memorandum of Progress/Closure Report

Based on the Progress Review Meeting, the Council Chairs or designated representatives shall produce a Memorandum of Progress, which shall be included in the official record of the review. The Memorandum of Progress would typically include the Progress Review Report along with any additional issues discussed at the Progress Review Meeting.

The Memorandum of Progress shall also describe any further actions that UgC and GC anticipate the unit will take prior to the next review. If the Review Team Chair recommends and Councils approve closure, the Memorandum of Progress will constitute the closure report.

Internal Review

16. Internal Review after Unsatisfactory Progress

The UgC and GC participants at the Progress Review Meeting may decide that the progress has been unsatisfactory. If so, they will bring the recommendation for an Internal Review to the Councils for a vote. If Councils recommend an internal review, they will conduct an abbreviated version of a site visit targeted to the remaining problematic issues. The internal review team will usually consist of one representative from each Council and no external reviewers. At the conclusion of the site visit, the unit chair and academic dean shall be informed in writing as to the outstanding issues, what is needed to achieve closure of the internal review process, and the time period within which it should be accomplished. The internal review team shall be responsible for monitoring progress and recommending closure to UgC and GC. UgC and GC shall confirm the recommendation to close the internal review and set the date for the next review. At this time, they shall also write an internal review report describing any further actions that UgC and GC recommend the unit take prior to the next review. This letter will be provided to the review team at the time of the next review.

NEXT REVIEW

17. Year for Next Review

The year of the next scheduled review for each unit shall be tentatively set by UgC and GC at the time the review report is approved. The final date shall be confirmed by Councils after the Progress Review Meeting. Normally, the next site visit will be scheduled 8 years after the current site visit. The reviews of units that are also reviewed by accreditation teams should, as much as possible, be coordinated with the accreditation evaluation, assuming the unit wishes such

coordination. In scheduling the year of the next review, consideration may also be given to evening out the number of reviews conducted by the Councils in a given year.

18. Early Review

On rare occasions, when compelling need has been demonstrated, UgC and GC may decide to review a unit earlier than scheduled. The request to consider an early review may be initiated by either Council or by students, faculty members, or administrators directly associated with the unit. The UgC and GC will decide whether there is a basis for considering the request. If so, they will carry out preliminary fact finding to decide whether to grant the request. It is expected that requests for early reviews will be made infrequently.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

19. Suspension of Admissions

Cause for the suspension of admissions includes but is not limited to a program's failure to fulfill its teaching and research mission, disregard for student and/or faculty welfare, and/or the inability to deliver its programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts. A suspension of admissions may also be cause for the recommendation of academic receivership.

20. Receivership

Academic receivership is defined as the appointment of an individual external to the unit who will be vested with sufficient administrative authority to oversee implementation of the recommendations of the Councils. The appointment of a receiver falls under the purview of the relevant dean or provost. The receiver may be appointed chair, or may be charged to work closely with the chair as a temporary administrative adjunct.

The Senate Report may include a recommendation to the relevant administrator that a unit be placed in academic receivership. Cause for the recommendation for receivership includes, but is not limited to cases where an academic unit is unable or unwilling to govern itself in accordance with the principles of shared governance, where it is in noncompliance with the Academic Senate's Program Review process, where it is failing to fulfill its teaching and research mission, where disregard for student and faculty welfare is evident; or where the inability to deliver its programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts is in evidence. In each case, the recommendation for receivership will be accompanied by a recommendation for an early review.

21. Appendix V Actions

Should the unit under review prove to be unwilling, unable, or incapable of adequately addressing the issues that lead to a suspension of admissions and/or a recommendation for receivership, the Graduate and/or Undergraduate Council may initiate any of the actions set forth in Appendix V. In such an instance, the "Procedures for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance of academic programs and units" will be followed.

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

**GUIDELINES FOR THE LETTER OF DEPARTMENTAL COMMITMENT
TO INTERDEPARTMENTAL DEGREE PROGRAM (IDP)
(Revised October 2001)**

The following is a guide to composing departmental letters of support for IDPs. While individual departmental statements may differ, letters of commitment should address each of the following points.

1. A general summary of the will of the department, indicating:
 - a. specific IDP degree program in question
 - b. depth of departmental support (results of faculty vote)
 - c. term of commitment (usually from 3 to 8 years)
 - d. expected departmental representation on IDP's Administrative (or Steering) Committee.
2. A description of relevant departmental faculty (including rank and field of interest, and if appropriate, percentage of FTE allocated to the IDP) during term of commitment, indicating:
 - a. departmental faculty member(s) who will belong to IDP's Steering Committee
 - b. departmental faculty member(s) who will belong to the IDP's core faculty
 - c. other departmental faculty member(s) who will be expected to participate regularly in the IDP's offerings
 - d. other departmental faculty member(s) who teach in areas related to the IDP.
3. The degree to which the department is willing to recruit replacement faculty for service in the IDP when necessary and to increase the number of committed faculty members in response to increased IDP enrollments.
4. The degree to which, on personnel matters, the department is willing to recognize the service of its members in the IDP.
5. The degree to which the department will supply the following:
 - a. release time for a departmental faculty member who serves as IDP chair
 - b. teaching assistantships (within the department) for graduate students enrolled in the IDP
 - c. departmental laboratory, office, or carrel space, or equipment, for use by the IDP's students
 - d. departmental administrative or secretarial service and space for use by the IDP.
6. Any budgetary constraints affecting the department's continued support of the IDP.
7. All courses (including course number, title, and whether required or elective) listed by the IDP that the department will regularly offer every year.
8. All courses (including course number, title, and whether required or elective) listed by the IDP that the department will offer intermittently.

With the letter of departmental commitment, please enclose two copies of the CVs for all departmental faculty members who are expected to contribute courses to the IDP. We prefer shorter rather than longer CVs (e.g., a 2-page biographical sketch rather than a full CV), but send whatever CV is available. There is no need to create a special CV to accompany the commitment letter.

ACADEMIC SENATE GUIDELINES FOR THE SITE VISIT (Revised June 2007)

1. Introduction

The site visit is an essential part of the academic program review process at UCLA. It brings together off-campus disciplinary experts and UCLA faculty and students to meet with students, faculty, staff, and administrators associated with the program being reviewed. Prior to the site visit, review team members will have studied the program's self-review report and other written materials. Through interviews, examination of written materials, and discussion among themselves during the site visit, the review team will further develop its understanding of the program. The aim is to arrive at a balanced assessment of the academic program's strengths and achievements, its future goals and plans, and areas in need of improvement. Such an assessment is important to UCLA's efforts to recognize, support, and promote excellence in all its undergraduate and graduate academic programs.

2. Site Visit Structure

The basic elements of the site visit are established well in advance by the Undergraduate Council (UgC) and Graduate Council (GC), the UCLA Academic Senate (faculty) committees responsible for program reviews. Decisions are made in consultation with the academic unit whose program is being reviewed, relevant academic administrators, and other Senate sources.

A. Composition of the Review Team. The composition of the review team is flexible, depending primarily on the size and complexity of the academic program. A review team examining both undergraduate and graduate programs may be composed of: 1) 1-2 UgC members, 2) 1-2 GC members, and 3) 1 or more External Reviewers. The norm is 2 of each type. The immediately incoming and immediately outgoing UgC and GC Chairs will be responsible for identifying each program review team and its chair, who will be one of the UgC or GC members.

B. Duration of the Site Visit. The duration of the site visit is also flexible, again depending on the size and complexity of the academic program. The norm is two days, with a review team dinner before the first day. However, site visits may be scheduled for longer and shorter periods. The immediately incoming and immediately outgoing UgC and GC Chairs will establish the duration of the site visit. Normally, all review team members conduct the full site visit together.

C. Preliminary Site Visit Schedule. The chair of the review team and the chair of the unit whose program is being reviewed will meet to set a preliminary schedule for the site visit (see section 5). The review team may alter the schedule if that seems desirable during the site visit.

3. Student Participation

At the pre-site visit meeting, the review team chair should consult with the unit chair as to how all students in the department will be informed about the site visit meetings. Students should be informed that they may request directly to the review team to meet either before or after the site visit. The Graduate Student Association student representative assigned to the review is encouraged to contact students in the unit under review and inform them of the process and encourage participation.

Graduate Student Association representatives appointed to the UgC and GC have the opportunity to participate in several aspects of the program review process. They serve as a link between

students in the academic programs under review and the review team and as a voice for student concerns. Specific contributions of the student representatives may include the following: a) serving as contact persons for students who wish to provide information to the review team, b) summarizing this information for the review team, and c) attending meetings with undergraduate and graduate students during the site visit and providing written comments to the review team. Because they attend all UgC and GC meetings, the student representatives also have the opportunity to participate in all Council discussions of the review and its outcomes, unless they are in the department under review.

4. Information Provided Prior to the Site Visit

Prior to the site visit, review team members shall receive a packet with the following information: a) any letters sent to or prepared by UgC and GC summarizing issues identified as important for review by the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), UgC, GC, relevant academic administrators, the unit chair, and/or unit faculty, b) the self-review report of the unit whose programs are under review, including relevant statistical information, c) the prior review report and closure (previously termed follow-up) report, d) Appendix XVI, e) this document, f) a roster of review team members, including contact information, and g) the preliminary site visit schedule.

Not included in the packet, but available to review team members in the Senate's program review office (and on-site during the site visit) will be the faculty CVs and any available faculty surveys. Student surveys as well as an explicit statement regarding methods for obtaining the survey data, response rate to the survey, and any information necessary for clarifying the degree to which the survey can be viewed as representative of the total sample of students involved with the program will be distributed to the review team and the unit chair. Open-ended comments will be shown to the unit chair only if the respondent has authorized the release of this information

Prior to the site visit, the internal review team (at least two members) should meet with the relevant dean and chair before the site visit to discuss problems, areas of focus, and needs for additional information. This will help to focus the review, although the review team need not limit their inquiries and recommendations to the areas identified by the chair and dean.

5. Site Visit Schedule

Each review team shall conduct its site visit at UCLA. The site visit will begin with a closed organizational session for team members only and end with an exit meeting in which team members share their reactions with selected UCLA faculty and administrators. In between, a variety of required and optional elements will be scheduled. Sample schedules are attached to the end of this guide.

A. Initial Organizational Session. This meeting is for review team members only. It has the following goals: a) to introduce review team members, b) to identify major questions that need to be examined during the site visit, c) to review the preliminary schedule for the site visit, and d) to determine how the review team would like to structure the site visit to complete the work. The review team chair is responsible for the meeting and for any follow-up site visit arrangements that need to be made. This session can be held either the night before the first full day of the site visit or early in the morning of the first full day of the site visit.

B. Other Required Site Visit Elements. The following elements shall be part of each site visit: private time each day for the review team to discuss its work; private meetings with the unit chair, academic dean; individual or group meetings with a representative sample of faculty; individual or group meetings with representative samples of students

in each degree program under review; open time for faculty and students to sign up for individual or group meetings (as they choose); and unscheduled time in the latter part of the site visit when the review team may meet alone or with other individuals as needed. Due to differences in the expertise of different members of the review team, as well as the broad coverage required in the site visit, site visitors may choose to divide some tasks up and meet in subgroups to ensure that adequate opportunities exist to speak with as many individuals and groups as possible.

C. Optional Site Visit Elements. Several other elements are often part of the site visit. They include meetings with staff undergraduate and graduate advisers; meetings with faculty responsible for undergraduate and graduate programs; tours of program facilities (e.g., offices, labs, studios, computer facilities, lounges, libraries); reviews of student projects, papers, or performances; and an administrative luncheon. Some may be part of the preliminary site visit schedule. The review team may choose to delete them or add others.

D. Exit Meeting. An exit meeting will be held at the close of the site visit. Participants will include: the review team; the unit chair; the academic dean to whom the unit reports; the academic administrators responsible for graduate and undergraduate programs (Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs and Dean of the Graduate Division); the Executive Vice Chancellor; the Executive Dean of the College when appropriate; and the Chairs of UgC and GC. The exit meeting will normally be chaired by the Chair of the Council to which the review team chair belongs.

The Exit Meeting allows the Council chairs, and appropriate administrators to hear the review team's, and especially the external reviewers', initial assessment of the program under review. It allows for a last exchange of information (or correction of misinformation) before the external reviewers depart to compose their written reports. The review team recommends any immediate action that might be required before the final report; the team's comments also allow Council chairs and administrators to plan ahead for the rest of review process by indicating the degree of seriousness of any problems identified during the site visit.

The Exit meeting may, at the Council chairs' discretion, be divided into several parts. A first part, when the program is assessed and facts checked, will include all participants, including also the chair of the program under review. A second part, held without the program chair, may cover leadership issues. A final part, involving the review team and Council chairs alone, may be needed to discuss Council procedures and issues about the report.

The Council Analysts will attend the exit meeting and prepare an extended summary. This summary may serve as a basis for part of the review report.

6. Special Concerns

The review process requires judgment and sensitivity on the part of review team members. A few special issues that the review team may confront are raised here.

A. Representative Samples. During the site visit, the review team needs to be certain it has discussed the program with representative samples of faculty and students. While the meaning of representative will vary according to the program, it most likely will include consideration of subdisciplinary area, degree program, faculty rank, and student year in a program. In many cases, it will also include gender, ethnicity, and (particularly for graduate students) international vs. resident status. A representative sample will

rarely be achieved if interviewees are all self-selected. The team and unit chairs will have made an effort to arrange the preliminary site visit schedule to include representative samples of faculty and students. When numbers are small, all faculty or all students in a given program may be scheduled. As the site visit progresses, the review team may decide it needs to schedule additional or different interviews to be certain it has heard from a representative cross section of faculty and/or students about the program in general or about any particular matter that has arisen during the site visit.

B. Evidence. The review team needs to be sensitive to evidence, particularly for allegations of inadequate performance, misconduct, or wrongdoing. In some cases, the review team will need to ascertain whether an opinion (e.g., that a program is seriously under-funded or that the unit chair is inattentive to his or her duties) is widely shared. In other cases, the review team will need to be able to provide enough specifics (e.g., who did what when to whom) to permit verification or rebuttal. If such matters arise during the site visit, the review team should adjust the site visit schedule or make other arrangements (see below) to investigate them adequately before including them in any oral or written review report.

C. Confidentiality. Review teams will sometimes become privy to information that may need to remain confidential. Issues of confidentiality should be raised first with the person who presents the potentially confidential information. How to handle the information may then be discussed with the review team chair and/or the UgC or GC Chairs. Clearly confidential information needs to be respected in all oral and written communications of the review team.

D. Wrongdoing. Occasionally, allegations of serious misconduct (e.g., harassment, falsification, misappropriation) will be made during a site visit. It is not the review team's responsibility to handle these. They should be reported to the review team chair, who will discuss them with the UgC and/or GC Chair, who will refer them to the appropriate UCLA officials.

7. Review Team Report

The review team chair(s) is responsible for submitting the review report within 4 academic-session weeks after the site visit. External reviewers shall each submit an individual report within 2 weeks after the site visit. For details, see separate guidelines for the final report.

SAMPLE SITE VISIT SCHEDULES

Normal Schedule Offering Both Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Prior to Day 1

7:00 p.m. Dinner meeting: Initial organizational session for review team members only (to be arranged by ASO).

Day 1

- 8:00 Breakfast discussion with unit chair and vice chair. [Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office.]
- 9:00 Meeting with Academic Dean.
- 10:00 Meetings with representative groups of faculty in major programs, by subdisciplinary area and/or degree program.
- 12:00 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:15 Meetings with representative undergraduate students in major programs.
- 2:00 Meetings with representative graduate students in major programs.
- 2:45 Review of Teaching Assistant Program. Meetings with selected faculty and students.
- 3:15 Review of Advising. UgC and GC members review undergraduate and graduate advising respectively.
- 4:00 Closed session for review team only.
- 5:00 Additional meetings if the team needs them, perhaps a reception or dinner especially for the external reviewers, or free time.

[Please note: A reception, dinner or other event on this evening may be hosted by the department. However, the Academic Senate will not reimburse the department for this expense.]

Day 2

- 8:00 Breakfast (review team members only)
- 8:30 Open individual meetings with faculty and students who want them. This may also include time for a tour of the department and affiliated facilities.
- 12:00 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:00 Meeting with other staff, lab personnel, development officers, etc.
- 2:00 Closed session (review team members only).
- 3:00 Final review team meeting with chair and vice chair(s).
- 4:00 Exit Meeting. Includes Review Team, Chair and Vice Chair of Department, Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Dean, Graduate Division Dean, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, UgC and GC Chairs, FEC Rep, and CPB rep. To be arranged by ASO.

Note:

- 1) Please allow appropriate flexibility to permit sufficient time for student meetings, especially in a department that has multiple degree programs.
- 2) TAs will have the opportunity to meet without departmental faculty, staff, or administrators present to allow the review team the opportunity to speak frankly with TAs from the department.
- 3) The unit is encouraged to select TAs who represent a broad range of TA experiences (TAs who have taught large classes, small classes, labs (if applicable), introductory classes, upper-division classes, etc.)
- 4) The review team chair should make every effort to ensure sufficient time for all meetings scheduled.
- 5) The schedule should be flexible and accommodate review of any and all articulated, concurrent, and self-supporting programs.

Department Staff Contact:

Schedule for a Small Program or One-day Internal Review Offering Both Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Day 1

- 8:00 Initial organizational breakfast session for review team members only. [Catering to be arranged by the Academic Senate Office.]
- 8:30 Meeting with academic dean.
- 9:00 Meeting with unit chair and vice chair.
- 10:00 Meetings with all faculty, perhaps in small groups.
- 12:00 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:00 Meetings with representative undergraduate (UgC members and student representatives) students in major programs.
- 1:30 Meetings with representative graduate (GC members and student representatives) students in major programs.
- 2:00 Review of Advising. UgC and GC members review undergraduate and graduate advising respectively.
- 3:00 Additional individual meetings with faculty or student groups. Open time.
- 3:30 Closed session (review team only).
- 4:15 Final meeting with Chair.
- 5:00 Exit meeting. The meeting includes Review Team, Chair and Vice Chair of Department, Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Dean, Graduate Division Dean, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, UgC and GC Chairs, FEC Rep, and CPB rep. To be arranged by ASO.

Note:

- 1) Please allow appropriate flexibility to permit sufficient time for student meetings, especially in a department that has multiple degree programs.
- 2) TAs will have the opportunity to meet without departmental faculty, staff, or administrators present to allow the review team the opportunity to speak frankly with TAs from the department.
- 3) The unit is encouraged to select TAs who represent a broad range of TA experiences (TAs who have taught large classes, small classes, labs (if applicable), introductory classes, upper-division classes, etc.)
- 4) The review team chair should make every effort to ensure sufficient time for all meetings scheduled.
- 5) The schedule should be flexible and accommodate review of any and all articulated, concurrent, and self-supporting programs.

Department Staff Contact:

Schedule for a Large Program Offering Both Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Prior to Day 1

7:00 p.m. Dinner meeting: Initial organizational session for review team members only (to be arranged by ASO).

Day 1

- 8:00 Breakfast discussion with unit chair and vice chair. [Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office.]
- 9:00 Meeting with Academic Dean.
- 10:00 Meetings with representative groups of faculty in major programs, by subdisciplinary area and/or degree program.
- 12:00 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:00 Meetings with representative groups of faculty in major programs, by subdisciplinary area and/or degree program.
- 4:00 Meetings with representative groups of graduate and undergraduate students in major subdisciplinary areas of program.
- 5:00 Additional meetings if the team needs them, perhaps a reception or dinner especially for the external reviewers, or free time.

[Please note: A reception, dinner or other event on this evening may be hosted by the department. However, the Academic Senate will not reimburse the department for this expense.]

Day 2

- 8:00 Closed organizational breakfast session for review team only. [Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office.]
- 9:00 Meetings with representative undergraduate (UgC members and student representatives) and graduate (GC members and student representatives) students in major programs.
- 11:30 Meeting with unit chair and vice chair(s). This may also include time for a tour of the department and affiliated facilities.
- 12:30 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:30 Meetings with selected faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students as determined by the review team in their breakfast meeting, presumably guided by the written materials available prior to the site visit and the external reviewers' experiences during Day 1
- 3:00 Review of Teaching Assistant Program. Meetings with selected faculty and students.
- 4:00 Review of Advising. UgC and GC members review undergraduate and graduate advising respectively.
- 5:00 Closed session for review team only.

Day 3

- 8:00 Breakfast (review team only). [Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office.]
- 8:30 Open meetings with faculty and students who want them. Review team may split up, if necessary.
- 12:00 Lunch – review team members only [at the Faculty Center]
- 1:00 Meeting with other staff, lab personnel, development officers, etc...
- 2:00 Closed session for review team only.
- 3:00 Final review team meeting with chair and vice chair(s).
- 4:00 Exit meeting. The meeting includes Review Team, Chair and Vice Chair of Department, Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Dean, Graduate Division Dean, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, UgC and GC Chairs, FEC Rep, and CPB rep. To be arranged by ASO.

Note:

- 1) Please allow appropriate flexibility to permit sufficient time for student meetings, especially in a department that has multiple degree programs.
- 2) TAs will have the opportunity to meet without departmental faculty, staff, or administrators present to allow the review team the opportunity to speak frankly with TAs from the department.
- 3) The unit is encouraged to select TAs who represent a broad range of TA experiences (TAs who have taught large classes, small classes, labs (if applicable), introductory classes, upper-division classes, etc.)
- 4) The review team chair should make every effort to ensure sufficient time for all meetings scheduled.
- 5) The schedule should be flexible and accommodate review of any and all articulated, concurrent, and self-supporting programs.

Department Staff Contact:

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.

**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.

ACADEMIC SENATE GUIDELINES FOR PROGRESS REVIEW (Revised June 2007)

1. Introduction

The academic program review process for any unit ends when the responsible Council(s) (Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), or both) confirm that the program(s) are adequate, if not excellent, and that the unit, academic dean, and any others to whom recommendations were addressed are either attending to them or developing reasonable plans to do so. Normally, a preliminary decision to end the review is made at the Progress Review Meeting, which is held 12-18 months after the Review Team Report is distributed.

2. Information Provided Prior to the Progress Review Meeting

Prior to the Progress Review Meeting, participants shall receive the following information: a) the entire Review Report, including all attachments and appendices, b) the unit chair's concise (1-5 single-spaced pages) response to the review report, including a statement of actions taken and in progress in response to each recommendation directed to the unit; c) the responsible academic dean's concise (1-3 single-spaced pages) response to the review report, including a statement of actions taken and in progress in response to each recommendation directed to the academic dean, and d) the concise response of any other administrator to whom a recommendation was directed.

Not included in the packet, but available in the Senate's program review office will be a) institutional and other data that were part of the self-review but not included in the Review Report, b) faculty CVs, and c) any available faculty and student survey results.

3. Progress Review Meeting

A. Participants. Participants are invited by UgC and GC. Ordinarily, people holding the following types of positions are included: a) chair of the unit responsible for the academic programs being reviewed; he or she may bring a vice chair and/or other academic administrators of the unit; b) academic dean for the unit; c) GC chair; d) UgC chair. e) the chair of the review team and another review team member (from the other Council when both UgC and GC are involved) may be invited if necessary.

B. Scheduling. The Progress Review Meeting, which ordinarily lasts two hours, will occur 12 to 18 months after the final review report is distributed by UgC and GC. Twelve months is the norm, but in exceptional cases the meeting will be scheduled no later than 18 months following distribution of the report. It is expected that all required participants will attend. Should a participant later find he or she cannot attend, the Senate review office should be notified. A designated representative, holding a related position and a member of the Academic Senate, may be suggested. GC and UgC will decide whether to include the designated representative, reschedule the meeting, or hold the meeting without representation from that office. In almost all circumstances, the Progress Review Meeting will be rescheduled if the unit chair or academic dean cannot attend.

C. Agenda. The agenda is flexible, depending on the particulars of the review and the views of the participants. The following topics will ordinarily be part of the agenda: a) consideration of the programs' strengths and accomplishments and of future goals and plans; b) actions taken and planned by the unit chair and academic dean (and as needed, other administrators) in response to the recommendations; c) any other actions needed and how and when they will occur; and d) and, if appropriate, reconsideration of the timing of the

next review. The Progress Review Meeting will be chaired by either the GC Chair or the UgC Chair, splitting the joint meetings equally between them.

D. Minutes. The Program Review Manager will prepare the Minutes of the Progress Review Meeting. The participants of the meeting will review the Minutes. The Minutes will serve as the basis for preparation of the Memorandum of Progress prepared for GC and UgC consideration.

4. Memorandum of Progress

The Council Chairs or their designated representatives shall produce a Memorandum of Progress to be submitted to the Vice Provost, Graduate Dean, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Executive Dean of the College when appropriate, and included in the official record of the review. The Memorandum of Progress should provide the UgC, GC, unit chair, academic dean, and any other administrators to whom review recommendations were specifically addressed with a written record about what has been and will be accomplished in response to the review recommendations and when the next review will take place. It should provide a basis, at the time of the next review, and evaluating what was accomplished in response to this review. It will be reviewed and approved by the Administrative Committee(s) for each Council represented in the review prior to presentation to the full Council(s).

The Memorandum of Progress should be a concise statement (1-2 pages) which includes the following topics and items:

1. What has already been accomplished in response to the review recommendations.
2. What will be accomplished in the future in response to the review recommendations, by whom, and in what time frame.
3. The year of the next site visit (including justification if there has been any change from the original review report).
4. Date and vote of each Council (in final version)
5. Attachments
 - Unit chair's response to the review report and recommendations
 - Academic dean's response to the review report and recommendations
 - Any other responses requested as part of the preparation for the Progress Review Meeting
 - Minutes of the Progress Review Meeting

5. Council Vote on Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Progress

At the next scheduled GC and UgC meetings after the Progress Review Meeting, the Councils will consider the findings and recommendations from the Progress Review Meeting. The approved Memorandum of Progress will be available to the Councils' members. The Council Chair or designated representative who wrote the Memorandum of Progress will present it. Ordinarily, the Councils will vote that satisfactory progress has been made and will confirm the following: a) that the review will be closed; b) what remains to be done in response to the review recommendations, who will do it, and the time frame in which it will be done; and c) when the next review will be scheduled. Occasionally, the Councils may determine that there has been unsatisfactory progress and there are compelling reasons why the review should not be closed immediately after the Progress Review Meeting. In this case, there will be an internal review, as described in section 6.

6. Internal Review after Unsatisfactory Progress

Councils will communicate the finding of unsatisfactory progress to the unit chair and academic dean and appoint an internal review team. It is up to the internal review team to decide when sufficient progress has been made to recommend an end to the review.

A. Information to Chair and Dean. The UgC and GC Chairs will prepare a joint letter to the unit chair and academic dean informing them of the decision to have an internal review and provide the following information: a) reasons why the review will not be closed at this time; b) what needs to be done, by whom, in order to close the review; and c) target date for closing the review.

B. Internal Review Team. Each internal review team shall have two members (one from each Council or two from the one responsible Council). It shall be chaired by the member from the Council which did not chair the review team or, if one Council is involved, by whomever the Council Chair appoints.

C. Internal Review Activities. The internal review team shall become familiar with the review and outstanding issues. Members will read the review report, responses from the unit chair, academic dean, and others, Memorandum of Progress, and letter to the unit chair and academic dean informing them about the internal review. The team will participate in a one-day site visit (without external consultants) and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted to the remaining problematic issues. When the internal review team members have concluded the site visit, they will prepare an internal review report.

D. Draft Internal Review Report. The internal review team chair shall be responsible for a draft internal review report that will follow the same procedures as required for a regular review report, and will serve as the basis for the UgC and GC consideration for ending the review. The other member shall concur with the draft. The report should explain why an internal review was recommended and what was accomplished during that time, identify what remains to be done to address recommendations of the review and how it will be accomplished, and suggest the year for the next review. The UgC and GC Chairs' letter to the unit chair and academic dean should be included in the attachments. The internal review report will be provided to the review team at the time of the next regular review.

E. End of Review. At the next scheduled GC and UgC meetings after the internal review report becomes available, the Councils will consider the findings and recommendations from the internal review team. The voting will be handled exactly as it is for programs closed immediately after the Progress Review Meeting. The internal review team chair shall be responsible for finalizing the final internal review report.

Academic Senate Program Review Faculty and Staff

Steven Nelson
Chair, Graduate Council
Art History
100 Dodd
141702
PH: (310) 825-2322
Email: nelsons@humnet.ucla.edu

Joseph Watson
Chair, Undergraduate Council
Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Science
47-429 Semel Institute
175919
PH: (310) 825-7587
Email: jwatson@mednet.ucla.edu

Linda Mohr
Director of Program Reviews/
Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Academic Senate Office
1215 Murphy Hall
140801
PH: (310) 206-2470
FAX: (310) 206-5273
Email: Mohr@senate.ucla.edu

Kyle Cunningham
Graduate Council Coordinator
Academic Senate Office
1215 Murphy Hall
140801
PH: (310) 825-1162
FAX: (310) 206-5273
Email: kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu

Judith Lacertosa
Undergraduate Council Coordinator
Academic Senate Office
1215 Murphy Hall
140801
PH: (310) 825-1194
FAX: (310) 206-5273
Email: jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu

Monique Steele
Council Administrative Assistant
Academic Senate Office
1215 Murphy Hall
140801
PH: (310) 206-2959
FAX: (310) 206-5273
Email: mmsteele@senate.ucla.edu