University Committee on Educational Policy
Comparison of UC Campus Undergraduate Program Review Practices
July 2008

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
1. Are undergraduate and graduate program reviews separate or combined?	Departmental reviews combine programs. Graduate groups and stand-alone undergraduate programs are separate.	Separately	Combined	Combined	Separately	Separately. Undergraduate reviews are conducted the year following the Graduate Review, when feasible.	Combined, but Undergraduate Council reviews undergraduate programs and issues, while Graduate Council reviews graduate programs and issues.	Combined
2. Is there a long-term schedule for reviews? ***How many years ahead does the schedule cover?*** ***What is the interval between reviews?*** ***Are there provisions for an early review if deemed necessary?***	Recurring eight-year cycle Early reviews can occur for exigent reasons.	Recurring seven-year cycle No provision for early reviews; individual programs may face an extra review between regularly scheduled years in exceptional cases.	Transitioning from a 7-year to a 10-year cycle. There are provisions for an earlier review, if necessary.	Two to eight year intervals scheduled annually in the summer. Early review may occur when there are concerns, or depending on findings and recommendations of the prior review.	The goal is every 7 years, but it may be more like every 9-10 years. No long-term schedule, the reviews are confirmed one to one and a half years in advance.	Programs will be on a 7-8 review cycle after 2012-13. Selection of reviews for the next year occurs the previous Spring. An early review occurs at the request of the department or Senate.	7-8 year intervals Each spring, reviewing agencies recommend which departments/ programs should be reviewed two years in advance. Early reviews are accommodated under unusual circumstances.	Six-year intervals in principle, but individual cases do get bumped earlier or later if there seems to be a need.
3. Who initiates and oversees the review process?	The Program Review Oversight Committee chaired by the Vice Provost for Academic Planning & Facilities Management (VPAPF). PROC includes senior administrators and representatives of five Senate Committees.	The Office of Resource Management and Planning (ORMP) notifies programs and provides data to the Senate Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Committee (UIPRC) of the Undergraduate Council (UGC),	The Senate Academic Program Review Board (APRB).	Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and Senate administrative team in collaboration.	The Senate Committee on Educational Policy	The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) initiates and co-administers the process with the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for UG Education. CEP coordinates all reports and correspondence.	The Program Review Panel (PRP), an administrative committee appointed by the EVC with Senate consultation.	The Vice Provost of Academic Affairs initiates and oversees the process, but the Senate is involved at every stage.
4. What office/ committee is responsible for the program review process guidelines?	The office of the VPAPF issued the UCB Guide for the Review of Existing Instructional Programs after input and vetting by PROC. Revisions are reviewed by the PROC.	The UIPRC with input from the college undergraduate program review committees, whose chairs sit on UIPRC and the joint senate-administration Program Review Task Force (PRTF).	The Senate Council on Educational Policy	The Senate Assistant Chief Administrative Officer.	The Senate Committee on Educational Policy	CEP with advice from the Senate-Administration Taskforce to Examine Program Reviews.	The Senate	The Vice Provost of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Senate.
5. What office/ committee is responsible for the self-review guidelines?	The office of the VPAPF in collaboration with the VP for Undergraduate Education and in consultation with CEP.	Same as #4.	The Senate Council on Educational Policy	Undergraduate Council	The Senate Committee on Educational Policy	The Senate Committee on Educational Policy	The Program Review Panel supplies specific guidelines.	The Vice Provost of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Senate.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
6. What data are required as part of the program review process? ***Who collects the data and makes them available to the program?*** ***Does the department collect and analyze additional data independently?***	The Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) provides data on demographics, satisfaction rates of undergrads and grads; faculty composition; faculty workload; curriculum and course enrollments. OPA help units analyze additional data on request. The unit may also supply data in addition to what is available.	The ORMP provides data on student enrollments, faculty, and resources; the Registrar provides catalog descriptions; and Student Affairs Research and Information (SARI) provides student and alumni survey data. In the self-review, programs compare themselves to other programs in the cluster and explain if and how they are significantly different. The college committee also may survey or interview current faculty and students.	At the outset of the review, the unit is given a list of what data will be provided by the Senate from central administration offices and what data they need to collect themselves. The unit refers to the data in preparing its self study. The self-studies and data are eventually given to external reviewers.	Faculty and administration of the unit prepare a self-study in advance of the site visit.	The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education supplies campus and program data and assists with the formation of the external review team.	The Associate Vice Chancellor for UG Education provides data on course enrollment; number of courses taught; grade distributions; funding and support; student instructor ratings; faculty workload policies; teaching statistics; faculty demographics; degree requirements; number and type of degrees awarded; numbers of majors; retention/time to degree; student satisfaction; alumni survey; and previous program review data Departments also collect and assess data they deem applicable and pertinent.	The administration provides data on enrollment, planning, research, funding, degree requirements, and organizational structure. The department provides data on faculty, research funding, awards, programs, administration, and students, assisted by the Office of Institutional Research or relevant college. The department also prepares a self assessment and developmental plan. The information is compiled into a *Data Notebook*.	The Office of Planning and Budget. In the past data have included number of majors, Student FTE taught, degrees granted (focusing on UG data).
7. Must departments state educational objectives for programs and courses and provide information about assessing success in meeting those objectives? ***In what form?***	Units state their educational objectives and how those objectives are met by their curriculum. There is a separate program run by the VPUE which works with units to set and measure educational objectives.	The self-study template asks programs to state the educational objectives of the major and how they relate to those of the campus; how effective the program is in meeting those objectives; plans to strengthen the objectives ; and how the program monitors and evaluates itself; To help, data is provided on current students and alumni perceptions of the success of the major in contributing to each objective.	Not required. Engineering programs provide this information as part of their ABET accreditation, but so far this is not required of other programs.	Departments complete a self-evaluation for both the graduate and undergraduate programs that includes a description of educational goals for the major. The evaluation is summarized by one or more outside reviewers, submitted to the Senate Administrator, and forwarded to the respective chairs.	In the self-study, programs are required to provide a statement of learning goals, educational objectives and departmental philosophy related to undergraduate students. What do you want students to learn and develop, and how do you measure their learning outcomes?	The self study asks programs to review all aspects of their instructional mission and to complete an *Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators* form required by WASC. The program lists various learning goals are states how it assesses the degree to which those goals are accomplished, including both department/ curricular-wide goals and course-specific goals.	The developmental plan asks departments to suggest improvements for enhancing their program(s). Past review responses and recommendations also serve as objectives. Progress plans are also discussed in the self assessment and developmental plan. If the department hasn't defined benchmarks, the UgC may request this information in its response to the Data Notebook and again in its comments on the ERC report and departmental response.	Not required.
8. Who provides staff support for the review process?	The Office of the VPAPF and the Academic Senate.	Home departments of programs (for self-reviews), staff for college review committees, Senate staff, ORMP, SARI, Registrar's Office (data collection).	Senate invites external reviewers, sends review materials, and oversees the process. Staff in the unit under review collect the self-studies, compile data and, prepare schedules.	The Academic Senate Executive Office (ASEO)	The Academic Senate and the VPUE office.	The Senate and the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education	The PRP Coordinator and assistant (both in the Office of Budget and Planning). Staff from the department help prepare the Data Notebook, and Senate analysts advise their respective councils and liaison with PRP staff.	Staff to the VPAA and staff from the Senate, deans, and department chairs.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
9. Who funds any extraneous costs associated with the review (external reviewers, unusual needs)?	The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. Minimum costs are borne by the unit (lunch for the ERC and reproducing and binding copies of their self-study).	N/A	The Provost allocates funds to the Senate for travel, honoraria, and other costs. The unit covers lunch and other expenses.	Academic Senate	The Senate gets a budget from the Administration.	The Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs.	The EVC	The Division
10. How is the dean's office involved in the review process? ***Do the internal review team members meet with the dean?***	Deans provide input at the onset of the review; review the charge letter to the ERC and the final outcome letter to the unit; meet with the ERC; and participate in the exit interview and final wrap-up meeting hosted by PROC. Deans are expected to assist units and oversee follow-up efforts.	At the college level, the program review committees report their findings to the executive committees, which then report their results to the dean. The dean forwards comments to UIPRC.	The dean's office prepares a self-study and the dean meets with the external reviewers.	The Senate Executive Office coordinates a meeting between the dean and the review team. The meeting gives the dean an opportunity to provide insight and direction regarding any special challenges the department has or will face.	The associate dean helps rank the potential reviewers, the associate deans and dean also meet with the reviewers at several junctures during the on site review.	The CEP Review Sub-committee presents a draft report at an exit interview that includes the divisional dean. The dean is invited to respond to the sub-committee's draft report before it goes before CEP.	PRP seeks comments from the dean on the charge to the External Review Committee and meets with the dean to discuss the major issues to be addressed by the ERC. The dean also reviews and comments on the ERC report and the department response.	The dean meets with the External Review Committee when it first arrives. The dean writes a response to the ERC review and dept response, which is forwarded to the Senate. The dean is part of the closure meeting.
11. Who proposes and selects the members of a review or ad hoc committee? ***Is there a member from Undergraduate Council or the Educational Policy committee?***	The PROC has overall responsibility. The 5 Senate committees that participate in PROC are Educational Policy, Academic Planning & Resources Allocation, Budget & Interdepartmental Relations, Graduate Council, and Status of Women & Ethnic Minorities. A representative of each participates in each review. For L&S units, the L&S Executive Committee participates and submits its input to the CEP.	At the college level, members of the program review committee are selected by the college executive committees. At the senate level, members of the UIPRC are selected by the Committee on Committees, and must include chairs (or designated representatives) of each of the college review committees. UIPRC is a committee of UGC, and the chair of UIPRC sits on UGC.	The APRB collects from the unit a list of experts in the field to act as nominators, who suggest potential reviewers. They may nominate themselves. There are two CEP members on the APRB.	The Undergraduate and Graduate Council chairs and ASEO staff select candidates for each review team from a list of Council members. There are also former Council members who have served on past review teams. As needed, review teams are supplemented with members from this list. Each review team has at least one current member of the respective Councils.	The CEP splits up its membership into three subcommittees: Review Team A: College of Humanities and Social Sciences faculty, Review Team B: College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences faculty, and Review Team C: Professional Schools faculty subcommittee	The Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education suggests a panel of on-campus and off-campus members for approval by the Senate Committee on Committees. The chair of the ad hoc committee is designated by, and is a member of, the Committee on Educational Policy.	PRP serves as the internal review committee for most reviews. In reviews carried out by an academic dean, the dean appoints the ad hoc committee in consultation with UgC. Internal review committees do not include UgC or CEP members.	The dean in consultation with the department. CEP provides input to the initial review charge, comments on the written review and responses, and participates in the closure meeting.
12. Is there an external review committee involved in program reviews? ***Who selects the external reviewer(s)?***	All program reviews have an External Review Committee (ERC). Units to be reviewed nominate reviewers. Nominations are circulated to PROC and the dean who comment and make additional nominations. The VPAPF makes the final selection of the ERC.	No.	The external reviewers are selected by the APRB.	The department nominates external reviewers using standardized criteria. The external reviewers are vetted by the respective Council chairs with input from the ASEO and vice-provost.	Three external reviewers are chosen by the subcommittee in consultation with the VPUE and associate dean of the appropriate College.	The ad hoc Review Subcommittee includes at least one non-UCSD UC faculty member whose department/ program corresponds to the department/ program under review. The list of potential external reviewers is developed in consultation with the Committee on Committees.	A single external committee reviews both undergraduate and graduate programs. Members are selected by PRP in consultation with the department.	The whole review team is external, and it handles UG issues along with everything else. The dean in consultation with the department chooses the team. CEP provides input to the charge; comments on the written review and responses; and participates in the closure meeting.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
13. With whom or with what committee does the external reviewer(s) meet (not including department faculty, students, etc.)? ***Do meetings occur before, during, or after the review process?***	On the first day, the ERC meets with the VPAPF and dean to discuss the process and review objectives, and has a meal with the unit head. The next day the ERC meets PROC and the Senate Liaison for breakfast and the unit head for dinner, 5 faculty from the unit, and the SL. On the final day, the ERC meets with PROC and the dean for an "exit interview" to give an oral summary of their observations and recommendations.	N/A	The ERC has three meetings: with the Senate leadership (including APRB and CEP chair) and the dean; with the provost and vice provost; and with the dean of the School under review. They also meet with faculty, students, chairs and directors.	External reviewers directly report their preliminary findings in a closed meeting that includes one or both Council chairpersons, the dean, and the vice provost for undergraduate and graduate education.	Assoc dean, VPUE and CEP subcommittee chair meet for dinner before the day of the on-site review. CEP chair, CEP subcommittee, dean and associate deans meet at the beginning of the review on the first day, the CEP subcommittee meets with team again separately and with the assoc dean at lunch the second day, then Chair of CEP, CEP subcommittee, VPUE meet dean again at exit interview.	The ad hoc Review Subcommittee holds an exit interview that includes the associate chancellor/chief of staff, associate chancellor/ chief diversity officer, divisional dean, the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education, and academic affairs support staff.	The ERC meets with the PRP chair, the EVC, the vice chancellor for research, the associate vice chancellors for academic personnel and diversity, equity, and academic policy, and the relevant deans. Chairs of Senate reviewing agencies and selected administrators meet with the ERC for a working lunch held at the end of the ERC's visit.	The dean meets with the External Review Committee when it first arrives. The dean writes a response to the ERC review and dept response, which is forwarded to the Senate. The dean is part of the closure meeting.
14. Does the review include a separate external reviewer report? ***Are specific guidelines given to external reviewers for this report?***	The ERC writes a report on the final day, recording their observations and recommendations. They are asked to address a list of issues ROC and the dean wishes them to address and any other issues that appear to them to be salient.	N/A	The external reviewers are given a charge that covers both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Their final report also covers both programs, with separate sections for each.	Each external reviewer writes a narrative report in addition to the preliminary oral exit report delivered at the end of the last day of the review.	The reviewers are provided questions that they can consider; however they are not given a specific format.	The external reviewer provides input directly to the Review Subcommittee chair, which is integrated into the draft report submitted to the program, to the dean, for response, and, ultimately, to CEP for review.	One ERC report covers both undergraduate and graduate issues. The ERC is given a detailed charge based on all reviewing agencies' responses to the *Data Notebook*.	The ERC writes one review that is typically broken into sections with one devoted to UG programs. Reviewers are given a basic charge, but any entity involved in the review process can add specific questions to the charge.
15. Do external reviewers receive an honorarium?	$1500	N/A	$1000 per member and generally $1500 for the ERC chair	$500/day (excluding day of travel to the site) + expenses.	$1k for chair; $750 for other two members	$500 honorarium and full reimbursement for travel expenses.	Yes. Amount unknown	Not sure.
16. What type of student input is included in the review materials?	Units solicit input from undergraduate and graduate students at each step of the review. They also schedule meetings with both groups of students during the ERC visit. The OPA data analysis makes extensive use of UCUES data and graduate student exit survey information provided by Graduate Division.	Data on current students' perceptions of the success of the major in contributing to each of the campus's educational objectives.	The Division of Undergraduate Education uses UCUES data to prepare a report on the unit's majors.	Generally, graduate and undergraduate student problems and issues have been identified in the self-study.	A confidential student survey is conducted.	Instructor Ratings from Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPE), a student-run organization; results of the UC Undergraduate Experiences Survey (UCUES); results of the Survey of UCSD Graduates; and results of a Career Services alumni Survey	Student surveys prepared by the Office of Institutional Research are included in the *Data Notebook*. Undergraduates are surveyed prior to the department's self-assessment and are interviewed when the ERC does its site visit.	Students are invited to meet with the external review committee as a group.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
17. Are students involved in the committee doing the review? How? ***Are there limitations to their participation?***	The ERC meets with undergraduates. Units under review are encouraged to include a representative group of undergraduates in gathering information for inclusion in their self-study. Units are also asked to set aside time during the ERC site visit for a meeting with a representative sampling of undergraduates.	UIPRC has an undergraduate member, appointed by Associated Students of UC Davis (ASUCD) and a graduate student member. They are expected to attend all committee meetings and to participate in preparation of committee reports.	Undergraduate students are not involved in review preparations. Majors in the unit have an opportunity to meet with the external reviewers during their visit. CEP student representatives are involved at the stage when CEP is reviewing the reviewers' final report.	The UG student government has elected not to participate in reviews. Graduate student government representatives do participate in the review of graduate student-related matters. Undergraduates are encouraged to attend the review team meeting. Reviewed-unit faculty are encouraged to allow students to attend the meeting if it is in conflict with any course being offered by the unit. Additionally, students may request individual or small-group meetings during the "unscheduled" portion of the visit.	CEP's undergraduate student rep hears the discussion of the review and of the report. S/he is allowed to give an opinion during the CEP meeting, but does not vote. Students are asked to meet with the external reviewers during the visit.	Undergraduate students, represented by majors and minors of the program under review, meet with the Review Subcommittee as part of the visit. Their input is integrated into the Subcommittee's report. Student members of CEP participate in all CEP meetings, except when specific student petitions are discussed.	UgC has one undergraduate representative present when the Council discusses the draft responses prepared on behalf of UgC by assigned lead reviewers. The student rep has access to the self assessment and developmental plan only.	Students are involved via student reps to CEP. They are privy to all materials and do not participate in the closure meeting.
18. Does the review committee or ad hoc conduct a site visit? ***Who is invited to these sessions?***	Only the External Review Committee and the Senate Liaison visit the unit under review. At the time the outcome letter is drafted there may be informal consultation between the VPAPF, the EVCP, dean, and department chair.	No.	The ERC has three meetings: with the Senate leadership (including APRB and CEP chair) and the dean; with the provost and vice provost; and with the dean of the School under review. They also meet with faculty, students, chairs and directors.	Review teams are *ad hoc* committees and are appointed by Council chairpersons about 4-9 months in advance. Throughout the 1-2 days of the review team's visit, sessions allow structured time for input from faculty, administrators, and students. Individual meetings with the review team also may be scheduled by members of any of these groups.	The external review team does a site visit in which the CEP subcommittee is heavily involved.	The Review Sub-committee conducts a two day site visit, during which it meets in various settings with administrators, faculty, and students.	The ERC participates in a two-day site visit, during which it meets in various settings with administrators, faculty, and students.	The ERC does the site visit.
19. Briefly describe the review process. Beginning with the self-study, what offices or committees review the departmental report; write a review report; and who reviews or comments on the final recommendation ?	The self-study and data summary are sent to the ERC and Senate Liaison. The ERC submits its report to the VPAPF, which sends it to the unit head for fact checking. The SL also submits a report within two weeks. The corrected ERC report and SL report are sent to the unit for response, which draws on input from faculty, staff, and UG students.	1. Program is notified about the review. 2. Data are sent to the program. 3. Department prepares self-review & forwards it to college program review committee. 4. Program review committee prepares review and sends it to the department, dean and college executive committee. 5. Department	The self-study is made available for review by the APRB, the external reviewers, CEP members, the provost, vice provost, and the dean of undergraduate education. The external reviewers' report is sent to the dean (with instructions to forward to chairs and faculty) for response. The CEP provides recommendations on the final report and the	External Reviewers submit individually written appraisals that are sent to all administrative parties and the review team chairs or co-chairs. The undergraduate and graduate faculty review-team co-author an internal report. The chair or co-chairs usually author the first draft for committee members. That report is submitted to the UG	The chancellor, EVC-provost, VPUE, CEP subcommittee members, and dean's office receive the self-study. The CEP subcommittee writes the report with input from the vice provost for undergraduate education. The CEP, Senate, EVC-P, chancellor, dean, VPUE, department chair and	The Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for UG Education compiles data which are delivered with a request for a department self-study. The self-study is forwarded to the Review Subcommittee and campus administrators prior to the review visit. The Subcommittee	The department's plan is reviewed by the PRP, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the graduate and academic deans, the UgC, the GC, and the relevant college executive committee. The ERC reviews the charge and writes a report, which the department comments on. The ERC report and the department response	Based on the self-study, the dean, Senate cmtees, and VPAA, can add questions/ issues to the ERC's charge. After the ERC writes its review, the dept, dean and Senate cmtees (in that order) write responses. A closure meeting occurs later involving all parties (including dean of undergraduate education), after which the VPAA writes a final

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
	The response is submitted to the VPAPF. All reports are sent to the five participating Senate committees. Their responses are sent to the VPAPF with a cover letter from the Divisional Council. All documents are reviewed by PROC, the dean and the SL and discussed in a wrap-up meeting. Finally, an outcome letter is drafted based on the final discussion and all written reports are circulated to PROC, the SL, and dean for input. Once finalized, it is signed by the EVCP and the VPAPF and sent to the unit head.	responds. 6. All documents are forwarded to UIPRC. 7. UIPRC prepares a report on each program and cluster and sends it to UGC. 8. UGC forwards UIPRC reports to department, dean, and provost.	school's response, which are sent with the report and school response, to the provost and vice provost.	and Graduate Council chairs, the Senate, and the assistant chief administrative officer. The report is vetted at a joint review meeting with UG and Graduate Council chairs and administrative personnel directly responsible for the reviewed unit, and the Graduate and UG Councils. The final report is discussed, revised and voted on separately by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.	program receive the final report.	conducts interviews during the visit and drafts a report that is forwarded to CEP. The program under review and the dean are asked to comment on the report. The draft report and comments are presented to CEP by the Subcommittee chair, and CEP issues its review. A 1-2 year follow-up is conducted to complete the program review process.	are reviewed again by the relevant agencies. The PRP sends a report to the EVC which incorporates the previous reports. Finally, the EVC writes a report to the department.	response with recommendations.
20. At what stage does the department provide a response letter?	Units are often asked to provide a strategic plan 6 to 9 months after the review is concluded to address issues raised in the letter. All units are asked to report on progress in addressing issues raised in the review for the 3 to 5 years following the review in letters to the dean requesting search authorizations for the coming year.	After the college review committee completes its report. The department response is included in materials forwarded to UIPRC.	Within six weeks of receipt of the external reviewers' final report.	The unit under review is appraised at every step of the review. The unit and its respective administrators respond to the final report and are apprised of any further compliance required by the Councils.	The department is first asked to report any misconceptions or factual errors. The department is then asked to comment on a first draft of the *Findings and Recommendations* and provide an action plan. The F&R are finalized in the CEP and distributed to the department.	The program is asked to respond prior to the report's presentation to CEP.	After receiving the ERC report.	Right after the review.
21. What is the outcome of the review? ***Is an action plan developed and monitored following the review?*** ***After the review is closed, is there a timeframe for follow-up?*** ***What form does a follow-up take; when is it done; and by whom?***	Deans monitor units' progress in addressing issues identified in the letter and report on progress in annual proposals for search authorizations. The VPAPF office also sends the outcome letter to the vice chancellors alerting them to issues in their purview.	In the next review, the program self-study is required to address outcomes of the last review.	Depending on the issue, an action plan may be developed based on the CEP recommendation to the unit. A formal follow-up report from the unit is requested by APRB after three years. CEP reviews the follow-up report.	A positive review leads to re-review eight years later. A negative appraisal could lead to suspension of admissions to a major. There are a variety of in between actions. Any requirements resulting from the review are provided in writing to the unit. The timeframe is clearly outlined. The follow-up timetable is determined in advance and the file is not closed until all requirements are completed. The Senate staff and the UG and Graduate Council chairs are responsible for oversight.	The department chair, associate dean, VPUE, CEP chair, and subcommittee chair meet to develop an action plan. Each spring, the CEP chair meets with program chairs to discuss progress.	CEP outlines the strengths and challenges of the program, suggests a course or action, and schedules a 1-2 year follow-up. At such time, an update is requested from the program on their progress and is presented to CEP by the chair of the Review Subcommittee.	The department's response to the report is monitored in one and three-year follow-ups. The EVC requests updates on a list of recommendations, to which the department must respond by a given date. Senate reviewing agencies review these documents and have the option to respond if specific concerns have not been sufficiently addressed.	The department submits a follow up report within 18-months that addresses issues in the review. Apart from this, specific actions are planned as needed.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
22. Of the various types of reviewers does one provide a better overall critique and perspective of the program?	Each perspective is valued and all voices are taken seriously. External reviewers from both public and private institutions are included and are drawn from the departments with whom we directly complete. The Senate Liaison provides an important internal perspective on UCB's culture and institutions, as do the five senate committee representatives.	Each provides a valuable perspective. The self-study is probably most valuable. It requires the faculty to reflect on its objectives and achievements and to compare them to those of similar majors in the college to identify complimentary strengths, gaps, overlaps, and common issues of concern. UIPRC does something similar across colleges and also works to ensure equability and effectiveness of the review process across colleges.	We use only external reviewers; they provide a good overall critique in general.	The overall critique as summarized by the review team. This report is a distillation of internal and external reviewers, all information gathered from participants within the reviewed unit, and the administrators for the unit, e.g., dean, vice-chancellor.	This is a shared governance process and all critiques have equal value.	Each member of the Review Subcommittee provides a wide breadth of experience and points of view. The Subcommittee chair, as a member of CEP, brings the unique view of the Senate central to program policy. The on-campus member provides additional perspective on issues related specifically to UCSD, while the off-campus member can provide a cross-campus viewpoint on issues related directly to the program under review.	All reviewing agencies offer distinct perspectives. Which reviewer is more critical depends greatly on the particular department and its strengths and weaknesses.	Difficult to generalize about who does better. We rely on the ERC to provide the integrated view, along with the dept and dean.
23. In an attempt to identify "best practices," what is it about your review process that is especially helpful?	The collaborative nature of the reviews is key to success. At each step, we encourage interaction between the various players and welcome all questions and feedback. We've also been told that we are unique in providing a cover letter with the OPA data summary and unit self-study sent to the ERC. The ERC members who take advantage of the letter find it very useful in organizing the material provided to them and in organizing their response.	We hope that some aspects of our new process begun in 2006-07 will help make the process more meaningful and efficient, especially providing extensive data on students, faculty, and alumni to the programs for self-reviews and reviewing programs in disciplinary cluster.	The combined review of the undergraduate and graduate programs provides an opportunity to review each component, as well as the interconnections between the two.	The *best practices* perspective as voiced by content-specific external reviewers, who are generally chosen because of their leadership in the particular field, and who bring professional organizational recommendations and reports to the table. Internal reviewers who are not members of the unit under review sometimes have closely allied content specialty or have no area expertise but have expertise in other areas that complement the review process, e.g., educational instruction.	It is a shared governance process run by the Senate. In addition, the programs are given thorough guidelines and ample time to prepare. The Administration (Dean's office and VPUE in particular) have taken the reviews very seriously and have been quite resourceful.	Several departments have commented favorably on the self-study as a welcome opportunity to internally assess their program. The exit interview, with its involvement of divisional and central campus administration, has led to direct feedback to the Chancellor and Senior Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs.	The coming together of differing perspectives.	Not sure, Our practices work pretty well.
24. Outside of the self-review, what about the process takes most time and effort?	Compiling the OPA data summaries, which take about six weeks per review.	Probably the collection of data by ORMP and SARI.	It is sometimes challenging to find external reviewers who will commit the time to the review.	For the reviewers, conducting the site visit and preparing for and participating in the review write-up. For the unit, responding to and ameliorating areas of concern can be more time consuming than the self-review.	Finding external reviewers and scheduling a date for them to visit.	Collecting program and campus-wide data for use by the program in their self-study has been very time-consuming, but the Office of the Associate vice chancellor has now assumed this responsibility. CEP also dedicates significant time to reviewing and discussing the Subcommittee's report and responses from the program and dean.	From the UgC's perspective the most time is spent formulating the questions to be addressed by the ERC and the department.	Effort is spread out over the various entities involved: VPAA, Senate Cmtees, Deans. This adds time to the process.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
25. What changes have had the most positive impact on the review process?	Establishing a set schedule of reviews on an 8 year cycle and the goal of completing them in 18 months; providing the data summaries to units to lessen the burden on them; promoting collaborative, helpful interactions between all the participants.	We hope providing extensive data on students, faculty, and alumni to the programs for self-reviews and reviewing programs in disciplinary clusters, will help make the process more meaningful and efficient	The ability to post information on secure websites decreases paperwork.	The revitalization of departments and majors showing significant problems developing and delivering high-caliber educational content, the improvement of educational outcomes; and of student, staff and faculty morale.	Since the upr's have just restarted in the last three years, few changes have been made at this juncture. We have attempted this year to find external reviewers earlier than before.	The involvement of the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education to coordinate the reviews in conjunction with CEP, and the addition of an external member to the Review Subcommittee.	Unknown	The Office of Planning and Budget has begun supplying depts with a standard set of data as part of their background to self-study.
26. What changes would make your review process more effective?	Engage alumni and friends in the review process; another .5 staff FTE to assist in compiling the OPA data summaries.	It is premature to know what further changes will be needed, having just instituted a new process to address concerns about the old one.	More effective collecting of review materials for preparing the charge and collecting data.	More participation by Senate Faculty in the review process. When there are problems, the ensuing reviews and remediation are also time consuming for the Councils.	Working on overcoming departmental hesitation about the stresses generated by the review process.	Increase some of the areas of assessment (i.e., service to other majors and comparable programs). Ask the review team to tour the department/program under review.	An assessment of the assessment process itself and the opportunity costs of the process. Is there evidence that it impacts educational quality? Could those person-hours be better spent doing something else?	Involve CEP earlier in the review process, because ERC's do not always give UG issues as much attention as they should.
27. What happens if a program is recalcitrant about participating in the review, citing reasons why now would not be a reasonable or possible time for the review?	We are quite firm about the necessity of proceeding on schedule. So far, only if a unit is very small and key players plan to be on leave have we adjusted the schedule and then by only about six months.	Under the old one process, the program would have been allowed to defer the review. Under the new one, they would be out of synch with the cluster, would have to wait 7 years, and would therefore be out of compliance with Senate regulations, which could hypothetical lead to denial of requests for resources in the interim.	The Senate insists that the review take place.	The most severe outcome might be a vote of *no confidence* and closure of a major to (student) admissions. This is a last resort and is undertaken carefully. There is every effort to work with the units to help them meet the goals of the review.	The CEP discusses the deferral request and whether the justification warrants a delay in the review. The CEP votes on the deferral request and notifies the department.	CEP reviews delay requests and makes its decision based on the justification.	The cooperation of the department is essential. Sometimes reviews are postponed.	They can be given extensions of one or two years for reasonable causes. After that the campus would push back.
28. Do you have programs that are not departmentally based and include faculty from multiple departments? ***How are their reviews different?*** ***Are there special problems that occur or changes taken in the review process?***	Out interdisciplinary UG teaching programs in most cases do not have assigned faculty FTE. We are developing a review process that will be meaningful and not overly burdensome to the units, proceeding in two phases: 1) a one-time analysis of cross-cutting issues and 2) establishing a schedule of individual program reviews to be integrated into the departmental 8-year review schedule. The parameters have yet to be established, but they probably will not include an external review component.	Their review is different in that they have the option to request data customized for a list of faculty most appropriate for their program, as opposed to the home department of the program, which is how data for most programs are compiled.	APRB assembles an external review team that is able to review all the programs in a given school, including departments, inter-departmental programs, and inter-school programs. We make sure the schedule has time for the reviewers to meet with the participating faculty and students who are outside the school, as needed.	There is a special review process for interdepartmental degree programs. Please see http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreviews/documents/GUIDEIDP.doc	It can be difficult to satisfy the entire faculty in choosing an external review team, it can be difficult to manage a larger review with so many faculty and even multiple deans and associate deans involved.	Interdisciplinary programs are reviewed identically to department reviews. Minors Programs are also asked to complete a self-study and are reviewed by CEP, but do not undergo a review visit. Scheduling reviews can take some time, but we have not had any problems with the review process in the past 3 years.	Sometimes such programs are reviewed by a process set up by the relevant dean that mimics the usual review process.	We are just starting to have such programs, and are still working out the formalities of review.

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
29. What other information do you consider important that might not have been addressed with these questions?	We view our primary client as the unit under review. We are forward looking and strategic. Reviews are not an audit nor are they intended to be punitive.		What is the total cost of a review? It depends on the size of the School under review and airfare for external reviewers, but the cost is about $200 per faculty member in the reviewed unit. For a unit of 100 faculty, it is about $20,000.	UCLA' guidelines can also be also be downloaded electronically at: http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreviews/PolicyAndProcedures.htm	Review Procedures are referred to in several instances in the response. the link: http://senate.ucr.edu/Committees/EdPolicy/UNDERGRADUATE%20PROGRAM%20REVIEW%20PROCEDURES.pdf	Creating a UC data set for departments to use when assessing their program may be helpful (i.e., enrollments, course requirements, FTEs) for comparison across campuses.		