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

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MERCED

Section 1. Program Review General Information

1.1 UC Merced Undergraduate Reviews

One of the mandates of the Undergraduate Council (UGC) of the Academic Senate is to conduct regular reviews of current undergraduate programs for their quality and appropriateness. The purpose is to promote excellence in undergraduate education. It is an opportunity for undergraduate programs to evaluate past achievements, current status, and plans for the future.

Each undergraduate program is normally reviewed every five years. There is a 2.5- to 3-year period for self-review and external review. Thus, the full cycle for program review is 8 years. The first review begins five years subsequent to UGC program approval. Annual assessment and data collection is ongoing throughout this process. A program may be reviewed more frequently by administrative request or where problems have arisen that require UGC's consideration. Where opportunity for improvement is identified, the review will give guidance to the program and to administrators about how such opportunities may be pursued. Where programs are inadequate, the review will suggest concrete steps to rectify weaknesses and enable a return to an acceptable standard. In some cases, UGC may recommend suspension of admission that could lead to the closure of the undergraduate program. For those programs that are healthy, the review process will endorse the program's operation and direction.

The Program Review Committee (PRC), a standing subcommittee of the UGC to be created in the near future, conducts the Undergraduate Program Review. The PRC consists of 3 to 5 Academic Senate members, one undergraduate student representative, and two ex-officio members. The ex-officio members are the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE) and an Academic Senate staff analyst.

For each review, a review team is recruited that is composed of an ad hoc committee and at least one external reviewer. The review team is selected from lists generated with input from the program chair (or other designated program faculty representative) and faculty, relevant deans, and PRC members. The ad hoc committee is chaired by the PRC liaison (an active member of the PRC) and two other UC Merced faculty members in related fields who are not members of the undergraduate program under review. External reviewers are selected from a list of prominent members of the appropriate field(s) who are outside UC Merced. (Normally there is one external reviewer, but in the case where conflicts of interest make it difficult to identify 3 UC Merced faculty members for the ad hoc review committee, more than one external reviewer may be included.)

Systematic, regular review of undergraduate academic programs is intended to ensure that students are learning what we intend to teach, that our students experience the benefits of learning in a research university, that our educational efforts are appropriate to a diverse student body, and that scholarly inquiry will inform educational processes and outcomes. Review gives undergraduate programs an opportunity to evaluate past achievements, current status, and plans for the future in order to ensure that UC Merced's undergraduate experience improves and remains pertinent to student, university and societal needs.

The undergraduate review process requires documentation and self-evaluation, including:

- the program's self-review;
- confidential questionnaires completed by the undergraduate program's faculty and students;
- a two-day meeting by the review team with the faculty and students of the program;
- reports from the review team;
- the program's corrections of fact to the review team's reports;
- the PRC's report and UGC's letter of transmittal;
- responses from the program and administrators to the PRC report;
- the PRC's assessment of the responses from the program to the PRC report;
- a recommendation to UGC for closure of the review or for further action; and
- a conclusion of the process with a vote by the UGC.

1.2 Criteria for Evaluating and Prioritizing Undergraduate Programs

Approved by Undergraduate Council on May 27, 2009

It is the UGC's responsibility to evaluate the academic components of undergraduate programs and to identify those that best define the distinctive character of UC Merced's mission as a research university.

Guidelines, Standards, and Measures: Criteria to be considered in identifying and prioritizing undergraduate programs that contribute to the quality of the campus include:

- the quality of the curriculum
    - a clear statement of mission and goals;
    - a curriculum that is appropriate to the mission and reflects current thinking in the discipline or field;
    - members contributing to the establishment and attainment of program goals;
    - appropriate, assessable and aligned statements of student learning goals and outcomes at the course and program levels;
    - faculty, students, and staff engaged annually in assessment processes and using expert feedback and student learning results to inform programmatic practices.
    - effective advising; and
    - effective support services specific to the curriculum (e.g., tutoring, internship placements).
- the quality of the faculty
    - consistently good teaching in courses;[1]

[1] See APM 210-1-d for definitions and for required documentation in personnel actions

    - effective advising; and
    - actively engaged in significant research or other relevant creative endeavors
- the record of achievement of the program:
    - most students are:
        - successful in achieving the learning outcomes of the program at expected levels;
        - successful in meeting the requirements of the program in a timely fashion; and
        - successful in competing for appropriate placements after graduation.
    - some faculty may be noted for excellence in teaching as well as in research;
    - the program may be known for public service relevant to disciplinary potential;
    - the program honors the University's goals of diversity in its student cohorts and in its faculty;[2]
    - the program provides the facilities necessary for student learning and research;
    - the program works to improve student retention and completion rates; and
    - an effective assessment process to improve programmatic practices related to student attainment of education and outcomes
- the contribution and centrality of the program to the missions and goals of the campus and the state;
- the contribution of the program to other fields of study at UC Merced;
- the anticipated future of the program and its discipline(s);
    - reflects academic vitality and is engaged with distinctive or emerging intellectual directions;
    - recognizes and prudently adopts new approaches to undergraduate education; and
    - provides an education that will allow program graduates to pursue post-baccalaureate education or current and future employment opportunities
- the FTE, financial and facilities resources required in developing or maintaining the strength of the program.

As teaching and scholarship are dynamic, it is expected that the faculty will propose new undergraduate programs in the future. The criteria for evaluating newly proposed programs differ from those used in evaluating existing programs in that a new program would not have a record of accomplishment.

The paramount criterion on which all academic programs are to be judged must be quality, which is the excellence of achievements. This includes quality of the faculty, entering students, graduates, and the overall quality of the academic experience, as perceived by those associated with the program and by external evaluators.

Priorities: These guidelines will be used by the UGC, the PRC, and the review teams in reviewing existing programs, and by the UGC in establishing new programs. The UGC will use these measures in recommendations of establishment, continuation, or discontinuation of individual programs. The degree to which programs demonstrate success in meeting these

---

[2] University of California Diversity Statement, adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate May 10, 2006; endorsed by the President of the University of California June 20, 2006.

guidelines will be used to recommend resource allocations and to determine the viability of programs within the broad context of undergraduate education on the campus.

Practicalities: UC Merced is a new and developing campus with multiple undergraduate programs in various stages of development. As such, it is expected that some review activities and/or criteria will be impossible to complete or unavoidably poorly developed when undergoing undergraduate program review. In such cases, the limitations on the assessment possible should be stated succinctly. For example, some statistical measures may simply have sample sizes that are too small to be interpreted confidently.

The burden of program review may be large for small undergraduate programs, in which case existing methods of assessment should be used and independent metrics should be co-opted in the circumstances in which this makes sense.

Section 2. Guidelines for the Review Team

2.1 Basis of the Review

The review will be based on the guidelines established by UGC that are contained in the Guidelines Evaluating and Prioritizing Undergraduate Programs in Section 1.2 of this document.

2.2 Meetings

The review team will meet with the program faculty (including the Chair, when applicable), students, staff and relevant dean(s). The PRC expects a minimum of 75% of the faculty and a representative group of students to participate in the review meetings.

2.3 Review Questions

The review team may address any questions its members deem appropriate. The following questions are provided to the review team as a guide and to assist the program members in their preparation for the review. Of the suggested questions, only those that are relevant to the program should be addressed.

2.3.1 General

1. What are the program's educational goals and outcomes? What role is it expected to play on campus in terms of its educational offerings and research? How do the program's goals and outcomes align with those of the University of California as a whole? Is the program meeting its educational goals and outcomes, as well as the expectations of others? How do you know?

2. Does the program fulfill its role in:
   (a) attracting and retaining students of promise?
   (b) recruiting and retaining faculty members of quality, following its University and campus affirmative action plans?
   (c) justifying the instructional resources it requires?
   (d) flexibility in accommodating changes in the campus mission?

3. How does the quality of the program compare with other programs in the same discipline?

4. Using relative standards of comparison from the most outstanding programs in the discipline (indicate comparison within the University of California and nationally), how does the program compare in:
   (a) breadth of faculty (collectively) and their professional reputations?
   (b) facilities, library holdings, and financial support for further development?

(c) providing a learning environment conducive to student achievement of program learning outcomes and excellence, including co-curricular programming and learning support as relevant?
(d) the quality and number of students in view of the facilities, the size of the faculty, and post-baccalaureate education or career opportunities for graduates?
(e) student demand?
(f) placement of graduates?

6. What special characteristics does the program possess in relation to other analogous programs within the University of California? Does the program pursue opportunities for interaction with related programs on the campus or within the University? What is the impact on other campus programs and on the other programs within the university?

7. Has the program changed or developed special emphases to incorporate new knowledge and skills to meet the changing needs of students and the University?

8. What are the plans for future growth and investments?

9. Is the program meeting the needs of the discipline(s)? Of the students? Of the state? Of society?

10. What is needed to improve the program significantly?

2.3.2 Faculty

1. What is the state of faculty morale?

2. Has the program motivated and enabled faculty members to use and develop new knowledge in the discipline(s)?

3. Is there sufficient faculty FTE to support the program?

4. To the degree that courses are delivered by non-senate faculty, are these faculty included in the development of curriculum and assessment in such a way as to ensure that the courses they offer and the education they deliver supports the objectives of the program?

5. Is the faculty participation adequate to support the objectives of the program, including those related to learning outcomes assessment?

6. Does the faculty receive appropriate credit for participation in undergraduate education?

7. Are faculty regularly evaluated for teaching effectiveness, including student course rating and at least one other form of evidence?

1. Do faculty take advantage of opportunities for enhancing their teaching effectiveness (e.g., workshops offered by the CRTE, off- or on-campus seminars, colloquia, and conferences on teaching and learning)?

2.3.3 Student Education

1. What is the state of the student morale?

2. Are students knowledgeable about the program's student learning expectations (outcomes), at both the course and program levels, and related assessments?

3. Are the students demonstrating achievement of learning outcomes at expected levels? How do you know? If not, what plans exist to improve student achievement? How will the success of these plans be assessed?

4. Has the program motivated students to participate fully in research in the discipline(s) (e.g., through the writing of senior or honor theses, etc.)?

5. Are the students being mentored and advised in a manner that is appropriate for the discipline(s)?

6. Does the program ensure that consistent information is provided to students as well as advising on program requirements?

2.3.4 Course Curriculum

1. Are course and program learning goals and outcomes aligned, giving rise to a cohesive curriculum focused on student achievement of appropriate skills and knowledge? Is the program curriculum aligned with institutional goals?

2. Are the core course curriculum, the number or types of courses/regularity of offerings, and the number of electives appropriate for the discipline(s)?

3 Is a multi-year assessment plan in place requiring annual assessment of student learning outcomes? Are annual assessments conducted, modifications implemented and complete reports filed as expected? Who receives these reports? Are they integrated into budgeting and planning processes? Are the reports reviewed by a knowledgeable person or committee that offers timely and constructive feedback that is used by the program as appropriate?

4 In preparation for this review, have the faculty evaluated the multi-year assessment plan and the associated assessment results? How has this evaluation been used to revise the multi-year assessment plan?

2.3.5 Resources and Infrastructure

1. Are sufficient resources being allocated by the University to the undergraduate program in order to allow it to meets it goals, such as financial resources, space, facilities, and equipment?

2. Are the resources allocated to it used efficiently and effectively?

3. Is the number of faculty FTEs appropriate for the existing size of the program? How many FTEs will be needed to realize future objectives?

4. Is there sufficient administrative support?

5. Is there sufficient technical support?

6. Is adequate infrastructure and financial support in place for annual assessment of student learning?

7. Are the program's plans for improvement, based on annual assessment, supported by the institution?

Section 3. Program Review Stages

- **Stage I: Notification of Review**

In the early Fall semester, UGC will initiate the reviews of undergraduate programs for the subsequent academic year. Notification of pending review will be sent to the program the previous spring semester.

The program chair (or other designated program faculty representative) is responsible for the review of the undergraduate program and will be considered by PRC as the main contact person for the review. In order for the self-review document to be completed on schedule, PRC encourages the chair or designated faculty representative to establish an ad hoc committee of faulty and staff from the undergraduate program to assist in preparing the self-review document.

It is emphasized that while staff could be responsible for gathering data for the review, it is the responsibility of the faculty to compose the Executive Summary for the self-review, which includes the Mission Statement and the Strategic Plan.

- **Stage II: Orientation Meeting**

In the Fall, the PRC chair will host an orientation meeting with the chairs of the undergraduate programs to be reviewed. The purpose of the meeting will be to answer questions regarding the self-review process and the self-review document. Once the meeting has been held, the undergraduate program chair (or designated faculty representative) should notify the program's faculty and students of the review; explain the importance of participating in the preparation of the self-review document, the confidential questionnaires, and the review meetings; and direct them to UGC's Program Review web page (to be developed in the near future) that describes the review process.

- **Stage III: Self-Review Preparation**

The process for preparing the self-review includes three steps:

1. Gathering and compilation of the data for the program review (to be performed by the appropriate administrative units, including the VPUE's office, the relevant Dean's office, Institutional Planning and Analysis, and other campus administration offices);
2. Review by the faculty of the program's curriculum, degree requirements, learning goals and outcomes, faculty membership, advising guidelines, and the program's website and other promotional materials;
3. Analysis of annual assessment results, including implemented changes, and articulation of an updated multi-year assessment plan.

4. Preparation by the faculty of the Executive Summary, based on their analysis of the data collected.

- **Stage IV: Review Team Nominations and Recruitment**

In Fall or early winter, letters requesting nominations for the review team members will be e-mailed to the undergraduate program chairs (or faculty representatives) and relevant deans (the chair and deans will submit separate lists). The review team will consist of a three-member ad hoc committee and two external reviewers. At least one member will be sufficiently knowledgeable about learning outcomes assessment to be able to evaluate the program's assessment efforts. Programs must not contact people they are nominating. The nominations for the review team should consist of:

1. a list of five or more members of the campus faculty from outside the program to serve on the *ad hoc* committee; and
2. a list of three to five individuals who would be best suited to serve as the external reviewers in order to provide an independent assessment of the program. The lists of names should be in ranked order and the following information provided for each nominee:
   (a) nominee's address, phone number and email address;
   (b) a brief statement detailing the important or unique qualifications of each nominee regarding her/his potential service as a reviewer to the undergraduate program.

The list should be prepared in accordance with the conflict of interest policy below. It will be the responsibility of the program chair (or faculty representative) to notify the PRC of all conflicts of interest. Based on the information received, the PRC could decide that the conflict of interest is minor and does not present a concern for the nominee's service on the review team. However, even in such a case, all parties will be informed of any associations that have been raised as potential concerns. The request of nominations from the deans includes instructions to supply their potential names to the program chair (or faculty representative) before submission to PRC so that the program can identify any conflicts of interest. The PRC will recruit the review team from a final list of nominees provided by the undergraduate program, the relevant deans and the PRC members, or add internal or external members as seen fit.

Conflict of Interest Policy: The program chair (or faculty representative) is expected to consult with the program's faculty regarding the individuals to be nominated and ensure that there is not potential conflict of interest for any of the nominees, in accordance with the Conflict of Interest Policy below.

In the case of a perceived conflict of interest, nominees may still be submitted along with an explanation of the potential conflict. The PRC will review the information and make a determination whether a meaningful conflict of interest exists.

Ad Hoc Committee:

Internal Reviewers: Nominees should be faculty members on the UC Merced campus with expertise appropriate for assessing the program being reviewed, but who are not members of the undergraduate program under review. To avoid a potential conflict of interest, *ad hoc* committee members should not have been involved in teaching or advising in the program being reviewed. If potential *ad hoc* committee members have collaborated in research with any faculty in the program within the past five years, are currently listed as a co-PI on a proposed grant, or as co-instructor on a proposed course, the PRC will review the nomination for conflict of interest.

External Reviewers: Nominees may be from any college or university outside UC Merced. To avoid a conflict of interest, the individuals nominated as external reviewers cannot have been involved in an active collaboration in either teaching, research, or have been a co-author on any research publications with faculty in the program within the past five years, be currently listed as a co-PI on a proposed grant, or co-instructor on a proposed course.

- **Stage V: Confidential Questionnaires**

At the beginning of the spring semester, the PRC will provide program chairs (or faculty representatives) with information regarding the questionnaire process. It is important that programs provide accurate and current email information on the faculty (ladder-rank and non ladder-rank) and on the students enrolled in the program. Obtaining accurate and current email information is essential to the process. Before the email lists are submitted to the PRC, the program is responsible for testing the email addresses to confirm that they are correct and active.

During the month of March, PRC, with support from the offices of the program dean(s) and the VPUE, will solicit confidential and anonymous comments from the faculty and students of the undergraduate program under review, via an online questionnaire. A minimum 50-75% response rate is expected. The Review Team depends heavily on these comments to discover what is going well and what needs improvement in the actual delivery of undergraduate education described in the program's materials. The response rate also signals to the Review Team the engagement or disengagement of faculty and students in the program.

- **Stage VI: Submission of Self-Review Documents**

In July, the self-review documentation, consisting of the Executive Summary and the Data Section, is submitted to the PRC analyst.

- **Stage VII: Review of Program**

Once the review team is recruited, the PRC analyst will coordinate the scheduling of the review dates with review team members and the program chair.

The review team meets during a two-day period with the program's faculty (including the chair (or faculty representative), advisers, and the executive committee, if applicable), the

undergraduate students, the undergraduate program staff, relevant dean(s), and others, as appropriate.

Upon confirmation of the review date, the program chair (or faculty representative) shall notify the undergraduate program's faculty and students of the dates, the names of the review team members, the 50-75% expected attendance at the review meetings, and convey the importance of participating in meetings.

While the responsibility for coordination of the review lies with the PRC chair, the scheduling of the review meetings is performed by academic senate and/or VPUE staff. The staff will meet with the program chair to develop the review itinerary and explain the process for the review meetings.

- **Stage VIII: Reports**

There are three reports associated with an undergraduate program review:

1. The *ad hoc* committee (AHC) report;
2. The external reviewer (ER) report; and
3. The PRC report. This is the final report of the review to which the program and administrators will need to prepare a response to specific recommendations.

The ACH and ER reports are submitted to the PRC chair within at least 4 weeks from the date of the review. Once the reports are received, a request for correction of fact only to the reports will be forwarded to the program chair (or faculty representative). The purpose of the correction of fact is to look for errors only, not to make text changes or to respond to a recommendation.

Once the correction of fact is received from the program, the PRC report will be drafted. This report is a summary of the ad hoc committee and external reviewer reports and the correction of fact, if any. The report will be presented to the PRC for final edits and approval, and then to the UGC for final approval.

UGC's letter of transmittal and the PRC report will be forwarded to the program chair (or faculty representative) and administrators to whom the recommendations are addressed. UGC's letter may address specific recommendations or may provide additional recommendations. The program and the administrators will be asked to respond to the PRC report by a set date.

- **Stage IX: Follow-up Phase**

The Follow-up phase begins once the PRC report has been forwarded to the addressees of the recommendations. It provides the opportunity for various parties to communicate regarding the review recommendations and to then implement the recommendations or provide a justification as to why this is not possible. The Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC) is charged with the follow-up and recommendation of action to UGC. The PRC Chair chairs the committee.

Members include current and past chairs of the UGC, the past Chair of the PRC, the VPUE, and appropriate staff.

The PRCC will review the responses to the recommendations and follow up with those individuals as needed. Typically, not only the program under review is asked to provide a response. The PRCC will make a recommendation only after all parties have been given an opportunity to respond. The PRCC chair will forward a recommendation to the UGC to either close the review of for further action to be taken. The following recommendations may be made to UGC:

1. Closure of a review and initiation date for the program's next review: A program (and the relevant administrators) have satisfactorily responded to the recommendations and implemented them to the best of their ability.

2. Closure of a review with a status report required or early initiation of the next review (instead of on the 8-year cycle). A program (and the relevant administrators) have responded to the recommendations but concerns remain regarding some unresolved issues in the program.

3. Further action recommended: If a program (and the relevant administrators) have not complied with the recommendations of the PRC report, have refused to respond to the report, or PRCC's concerns have not been addressed, a recommendation will be forwarded to UGC for further action. The process is as follows:

   The PRCC may ask the chair of UGC to forward a letter to the program chair (or faculty representative) outlining the concerns of the UGC and requesting a detailed response to outstanding issues. The program's response would be reviewed by PRCC and then forwarded to UGC to consider the matter and determine whether a recommendation is needed to the relevant Dean(s) for further action.

   Actions that might be recommended to the Dean(s) include:

   - review of the program chair's (or faculty representative's) service
   - placement of the program under receivership
   - suspension of admissions to the program
   - closure of the program.

- **Stage X: Finalizing the Date of the Next Review**

Typically, the undergraduate program's review cycle initiation date will be reset to fall eight years from the academic year that the program's response to the PRC report was due. UGC retains the right to make regular adjustments to the schedule in order to balance the annual workload. In rare cases a review will be moved one year earlier. More typically a review will be moved back one year. The date of the next review will be confirmed once PRCC has completed

the follow-up phase for the program review. This date will be reflected in UGC's letter to the program regarding closure of the review or further action.

Section 4. Self-Review Document: Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should be able to stand alone as a relatively brief, concise document of the larger self-review. The composition of the Executive Summary is the responsibility of the faculty, and not that of the staff. It is a valuable opportunity for the faculty to have a conversation about the strengths, weakness and challenges of the undergraduate education they are delivering. The Executive Summary should be based on the data in the self-review, and thus should be prepared only after the self-review data have been compiled. Experience at other UC campuses suggests that the best result is obtained if the chair (or faculty representative) prepares the Executive Summary based on consultations with the faculty.

Great care should be taken in preparing the Executive Summary as:

- the review team will use it as the foundation for its interviews with faculty, students, and administrators and the foundation for their assessment and recommendations; and

- it will become part of the official record that will be included in the Self-review Data section of subsequent reviews.

Undergraduate programs at UC Merced vary considerably; the features of the program that might not be clear to colleagues outside of the program should be explained. For example, explain the role of tracks or emphases in the program or the relationship between the undergraduate program and other undergraduate or graduate programs.

The Executive Summary must be less than twenty-five pages, single-spaced, and summarize the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges faced in the program. The document should follow exactly the sequence of topics listed below. The writing should be concise and address all topics. *Do not simply refer readers to the more detailed sections in the Self-Review Data section.*

- **Section 1: Mission Statement**

  A review provides the occasion for an undergraduate program to revisit its mission statement or to write a new one. The mission statement should concisely declare a distinct purpose for the program in both teaching and research. At its best, the mission statement embodies the faculty's philosophy regarding this field of study.

- **Section 2: Learning Goals and Outcomes**

  1. Review of program's learning goals and outcomes in relation to School and/or campus-wide educational mission. Are they aligned?
  2. Review of the program's stated learning goals and outcomes based on assessment results and the ways in which these have changed in response to review of assessment results.
  3. Summary of faculty involvement in annual assessment of student learning, including review of student work and assessment results and the identification and implementation of programmatic changes based on these results.

4. Summary of student awareness of learning expectations and related assessments at course and program level.
5. General review of student learning achievements relative to expectations based on collective results of annual assessment plans. Address as appropriate, benchmarking against other programs.
6. Summary of any changes that have been made to curriculum or the program as a result of assessment.
7. Review alignment of course and program learning outcomes.
8. Review of multi-year assessment plan implementation, including
    a. annual report submissions
    b. timeliness and frequency of constructive feedback by assessment committee or specialist
    c. institutional support for and program follow-through on intended improvements based on annual learning results, including efficacy of steps taken
    d. identification of strengths and weaknesses of the assessment plan and proposed modifications/update based on collective results of annual assessment of student learning.

- **Section 3: Curriculum**

In this section summarize the rationale for the curriculum design (include a full explanation and all supporting documentation, such as catalogue copy, advising materials if any, etc., in the Data Section). Present information for the last five years:

1. Core courses: For each course provide:
    a. course title;
    b. frequency of offering; and
    c. a sentence or two about the course.
2. Electives: Provide a list of electives;
3. Briefly describe changes to the curriculum since the last review. If there have been no changes, provide a statement to that fact.

- **Section 4: History of the Program**

Provide a brief history of the program in the order listed below.

1. date the program was approved and date admissions were open;
2. name changes or mergers of the program and dates associated with those changes;
3. administrative home of the program;
4. degree(s) offered;
5. program learning goals and outcomes;
6. degree requirements - date of the last version approved by UGC and the URL where posted;
7. advising guidelines; and

8. dates the last review was initiated and closed.

- **Section 5: Comparison Programs**

  Provide a comparison with other comparable programs nationally and within the University of California system.

- **Section 6: Strategic Plan**

  Comparing the mission statement and learning goals at both programmatic and institutional levels with the present state of the undergraduate program provides the basis for a strategic plan aimed at accomplishing the mission and goals. The strategic plan must be developed in consultation with the program's membership and approved by them.

  The strategic plan section should focus on those aspects related to the undergraduate program, but the strategic plan itself may be more comprehensive, including ties with other graduate and/or undergraduate programs. This section should project actions over the next five to seven years and address:

  1. curricular evolution;
  2. changes in the student population (in number and/or quality);
  3. plans to shift programmatic emphasis or learning outcomes;
  4. approaches to developing new strengths or addressing weaknesses (including assessment instruments); and
  5. plans to merge or subdivide to achieve programmatic focus.

- **Section 7: Faculty**

  The Self-review Data section will provide detailed information on individual ladder-rank faculty members' research and teaching interests and strengths. In this section summarize the following information:

  1. Provide the total number of faculty in the program for the last three years that held membership in the undergraduate program.
  2. Include information on makers of quality such as teaching awards, research support, awards, prizes, etc. The review team realizes that these markers will vary considerably by discipline and area.
  3. Include information on faculty contributions to curriculum development, pedagogical practices, and any other teaching and learning-related matters, including contributions to campus-wide General Education and/or to other programs.
  4. Include numerical aggregate data from student evaluations for all courses taught during the period under review; this information should be organized by course number, not by faculty name.

- **Section 8: Students**

  An important way to measure educational effectiveness is to analyze retention and time-to-degree data in context of student profiles and benchmarked to national norms. With the cooperation of IPA:

  - insert tables that show retention, time-to degree, and GPA data for students in the program over the last 5 years;
  - disaggregate the data by programmatic track and by student profiles (i.e. disaggregate data by ethnic, gender, family income, family educational background, first language, transfer, and disability profiles);
  - having compared these data to national norms, assess the program's efficacy in retention and time-to-degree.

  Also provide teaching evaluations and assessment.

- **Section 9: Diversity**

  Diversity, as defined by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in the University of California Diversity Statement in 2006, is a core component of excellence and quality in undergraduate education. As part of judging of excellence, an assessment is required of steps a program is taking to yield a diverse undergraduate population. Diversity in undergraduate education will be judged with the context of the findings of the University of California Regents Study Group on University Diversity report published in 2007.[3] In this section, the self-review report of diversity must address the following topics:

  1. evidence of a strategy for recruiting a diverse pool of students and faculty;
  2. demonstration that the faculty are committed to the academic success of all students and are sensitive to the special challenges face by underrepresented and first-in-family undergraduate students;
  3. evidence of a culture of commitment to supporting a diverse undergraduate student population, with relevant incorporation of learning-support services; and
  4. quantitative documentation of success in achieving diversity in applications, admissions, enrollment and completion.

- **Section 10: Alumni**

Undergraduate programs are strongly encouraged to keep track of their alumni, and seek their advice and input on their undergraduate programs. The alumni section of the Self-Review Data Section will provide detailed information. In this section summarize information on the

[3] Undergraduate Diversity Work Team Report at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/07-diversity_report.pdf

placement record of your alumni for the last five years, including graduate programs, professional schools, and professional positions

- **Section 11: Status Report**

For programs previously reviewed provide:

1. Status of PRC report recommendations: Briefly provide the status of each of the recommendations form the previous PRC report.

    - Format: Each recommendation must reflect the same numbering and wording as in the PRC report.
    - The status of the recommendations as of the date of the current review. Do not reiterate the response the program made to the recommendation during the previous review.
    - Describe briefly each remedy and evaluate its present effectiveness.
    - If any recommendations were not addressed, explain why.

2. Other Key Changes: Briefly describe any key developments that have not been already addressed in the previous section.

3. Briefly outline any limitations on assessment due to the stage of development of the program.

For programs being reviewed for the first time:

1. Briefly address how the program has evolved since the program proposal was approved.
2. Other key changes: Briefly describe these changes.

3. Briefly outline any limitations on assessment due to the stage of development of the program.

Section 5. Self-Review Document: Data Section

5.1 Documents from the Previous Program Review

This section contains either the documents from the program's previous review or the program's approved proposal (for programs being reviewed for the first time). The PRC and/or VPUE analyst will provide one copy of the documents. The program is responsible for making the appropriate copies for the self-review binders.

For programs previously reviewed:

- The PRC and/or VPUE analyst will provide one copy of the documents from the last review that must be included "as is" in this section.

For programs that are being reviewed for the first time:

- Change the tab and section title to: "Approved Undergraduate Program Proposal."
- The PRC analyst will provide one copy of the approved program proposal, which must be included "as is" in this section.

5.2 Program Administration

5.2.1 Administrative Profile

The Administrative Profile is an overview of the organizational structure of the program. Provide the following information:

- *Program name:* If the name of the program has changed since the program was approved, provide the history of the name.
- *Officers:* List any current and past officers for program's committees, and/or for any other aspects of program administrations (e.g., Chair, if applicable, advisor, etc.)

5.2.2 Faculty Membership List

Provide a list of the ladder-rank faculty who has held membership in the program for the last three years, their academic title, and school affiliation.

Format:

- *Name:* Provide first and last names of the faculty member
- *Academic Title:* Provide the current academic title for each member

- *School Affiliation:* Note any joint appointments.

5.3 Student Information

5.3.1. Current Undergraduate Students

Provide a summary of current enrollments by class status, entering GPA, current GPA, standardized test scores, number of double majors, number of students participating in undergraduate research projects, number of students participating in Honors tracks, and diversity. The appropriate administrative units (e.g. Admissions office, Dean's office, VPUE's office) are responsible for furnishing this information to the faculty.

5.3.2 Alumni

Provide a list of students who have graduated since the last review and include the following information:

- Student name;
- Year graduated; and
- Most recent placement information: Graduate program or employer, job title, city/state/country.

5.3.3. Benchmark Data

A benchmark data report will be provided to the program to be inserted in the self-review. This report is generated from Banner and includes the number of applicants and the number of degrees conferred. The report should be inserted in the self-review document. No other action is required for this section.

5.4 Admitting and Advising Students

5.4.1 Advising Guidelines

1. Provide a copy of the advising guidelines for the program. Note: If a program has no advising guidelines, then the chair (or faculty representative) should discuss with the program faculty the need for the development of such guidelines.

2. Provide an example of the announcement that annually notifies the faculty and students of the program advising guidelines and the location of the URL.

5.4.2. Degree Requirements

Each undergraduate program must have a document approved by the UGC that contains all of the degree requirements for the undergraduate degrees that it offers and must share this document with its students. **A program may not impose requirements that have not been approved by UGC.**

Provide a copy of the program's most recently approved degree requirements[4] and a copy of the approval letter from UGC. If you do not have a copy of these documents contact the PRC and/or VPUE analyst for assistance. Note: if the information is posted on the undergraduate program's website it must include:

- the date the degree requirements were approved by UGC; and
- the exact wording as the document approved by the UGC.

In the event that is determined during the self-review preparation that the program's degree requirements need revision the following policies and procedures must be followed: While a program is in the "review phase"[5] degree requirements will not be reviewed by the UGC until the PRC report and UGC's transmittal letter have been forwarded to the program. Once the program review has been conducted and is in the "follow-up phase," degree requirement changes may be submitted for review and UGC will consider them as a priority item. It is expected that the undergraduate program and the UGC will work together to expedite the review, revision and approval process.

5.4.3 Courses Taught

Provide a list of the program's core and elective courses, when they were taught and by whom for the past five years. Also provide a list of courses taught by program faculty for other programs, including general education This information should be organized by year.

5.4.4 Recruitment Materials

Provide a copy of the program's current recruitment materials:

- current recruitment materials, such as brochures and website print-outs; and
- sample letters to applicants and admitted students and/or email messages used in a place of a letter.
- include copies of letters and materials used by the School.

5.5 Faculty Information

---

[4] This must be a verbatim version of that approved by UGC

[5] The "review phase" covers the period from the date the program's self review is submitted to the PRC to when Undergraduate Council sends the PRC report back to the program.

5.5.1 Abbreviated CVs

For each faculty member of the undergraduate program, provide an abbreviated CV (two pages at the most) that span over the last five years. Provide the following information:

- name
- highest degree, institution, year of degree;
- area of expertise (two lines);
- membership it the program's committees and other services to the program or university;
- number of publications, performances, and exhibits and five key publications or works.
- professional awards and honors (three lines maximum);
- conference participation and lectures; and
- service to the profession (including consulting, where appropriate).

5.6 Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Include all assessment plans, annual reports, and a significant sample of direct evidence used to support the conclusions in the annual reports. Tabular presentation of the alignment between the learning outcomes of core and elective courses and the program learning outcomes.

Section 6. Format of Self-Review Document

6.1 Number of Copies Needed

In keeping with UC Merced's standards for environmental sustainability, Self-Review Documents will be presented electronically, posted in a secure site as technology allows. Otherwise, size copies of the Self-Review document are needed

6.2 Presentation

The information must be presented precisely in the format described next.[6] The Executive Summary and the Data section must be presented in two separate electronic folders, titled appropriately.

The presentation of **Data Section** document shall be as follows:

- Cover page: Include the **Data Section**, name of the graduate program, and the year in which the review was initiated.
- Major headings: Each section and subsection must be present in following order and separated by tabs and a colored sheet of paper with the title of the section or subsection:

1. Documents from the Previous Program Review[7]
2. Program Administration
   a) Administrative Profile
   b) Faculty Membership List
3. Student Information
   a) Current Undergraduate Students
   d) Alumni
   e) Benchmark Data
4. Admitting and Advising Students
   a) Advising Guidelines
   b) Degree Requirements
   c) Courses Taught
   g) Recruitment Materials

   Faculty Information
   a) Abbreviated CV
   b) Undergraduate teaching evaluations

[6] If it is not in the required format, the PRC analyst will return the documents to the program for correction.

[7] If the program is being reviewed for the first time, the section title and tab should be **Approved Undergraduate Proposal**

6. Learning Outcomes Assessment

Section 7. Deadlines and Contact Information

7.1 Deadlines for 201X-1Y

1. January, 201Y: Review Team Nominations due to PRC analyst.

2. March, 201Y: Faculty and student information submitted for the confidential questionnaire process.

3. April, 201Y: The confidential questionnaire process is initiated.

4. May, 201Y: Optional – Programs can submit a draft of the self-review to be checked for format by the PRC and/or VPUE analyst. Content will not be reviewed.

5. July, 201Y: Deadline for submitting the self-review. Copies of the self-review should be submitted to the PRC and/or VPUE analyst.

7. July, 201Y: Submission of any changes to the Degree Requirement. While the requirements may be reviewed by UGC, the changes will only go into effect after the PRC submits their report to UGC on the program review, and after UGC communicates it findings to the program.

7.2 Contact Person

For questions regarding the format and procedures used during the review, contact the PRC and/or VPUE analyst.