U N I V E R S I T Y O F C A L I F O R N I A

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MARTHA CONKLIN, CHAIR
mconklin@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

June 19, 2009

PROFESSOR GREGG CAMFIELD, CHAIR
WASC STEERING COMMITTEE

RE: Program Review Guidelines

The development of policies and procedures and guidelines is one of the major activities of the UC Merced Divisional Council and committees. In a mature campus, most of this infrastructure is in place, so the main function of the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) is to conduct academic program reviews. To institute program reviews, Divisional Council is cognizant of both developing the guidelines, policies and procedures and the commitment of resources to implement such policies. In this letter, I am sharing the policy review process and the current progress on these policies.

Late this spring UGC and GRC approved Program Review Guidelines, after careful consideration of established guidelines at other UC campuses. Although we chose UC Davis policies as a model, these guidelines had to be modified to include program learning outcome assessments and structure at UC Merced. As program review will be performed by all academic units, we felt that they should be given an opportunity to comment on these guidelines. These have been sent out to the Schools and to other Senate committees for comments. There is a general agreement that the content of the Program Review Guidelines is acceptable; however, there are major concerns about their implementation. The primary concern is the staffing level required to support these guidelines and data and document management systems to support the accumulation of evidence and assessments, issues are currently being discussed with the administration. More minor comments related to the streamlining of faculty effort and more coordination between UGC and GRC are being discussed.

I am transmitting the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate and Research Council-approved Program Review Guidelines. The next step in the approval procedure will be for UGC and GRC to consider recommendations and send to their final version to Divisional Council for approval. Changes will likely involve developing a framework to implement these guidelines rather than modifying them (e.g., coordinated review between graduate and undergraduate programs). Although the guidelines are not approved by Divisional Council, faculty are implementing assessment plans. Meanwhile, the Divisional Council is working with the administration to insure that resources are available to undertake these reviews.

Sincerely,

Martha Conklin, Chair

cc: Divisional Council
Senate Director Clarke
Attachments