UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES

I. Overview

Systematic, regular review of undergraduate academic programs is intended to ensure that students are learning what we intend to teach, that our educational efforts are appropriate to a diverse student body, and that the benefits of scholarly inquiry will inform educational processes and outcomes. All academic programs – majors, free-standing minors, and General Education – are subject to Program Review.

Program Review is therefore both formative, in that it shapes the actions of a program in its ongoing development, and summative, in that it identifies particular issues and problems that may need to be addressed and identifies actions required to address such issues and problems. There are three phases to Program Review:

1. **Preparation**: The program under review develops a detailed self-study of its program and its effectiveness; the Program Review Committee (PRC) conducts confidential surveys of faculty and students.
2. **Site Visit**: A review team, with both internal and external members, visits the campus and meets with faculty and students in the program, administrators, and faculty from adjacent programs.
3. **Follow-up**: the Program Chair and relevant Dean respond to the self-study and present the response to the PRC.

The Program Review is closed only when the PRC reports to the Undergraduate Council (UGC) that the response of the program to the report adequately addresses the recommendations of the report. This normally takes place by the end of the second year of the Review. The combination of these activities allows for an evidence-based assessment of programs which engages faculty and administration, and that can be used as the basis for ongoing academic planning and for resource allocation.

Reviews of undergraduate programs are conducted under the authority of the Standing Orders of the University of California, the University of California Academic Senate, and the Merced Divisional Bylaws. Under Merced Divisional Bylaw II.4.B., UGC has the authority to establish and review undergraduate programs. Thus, UGC, with the aid of extramural review teams, and supported by the UCM Office of the Academic Senate is responsible for Undergraduate Program Review. The details of Program Review are coordinated by the Program Review Subcommittee of UGC, which consists of two members of UGC, and three additional tenured Senate faculty. While the Senate coordinates and oversees Program Review, the process, particularly during the site visit and follow-up phase, engages Senate and Administration. This ensures that recommendations from Program Review are integrated in campus planning processes.

The Undergraduate Council establishes the sequence of program reviews, a sequence which is revisited annually. The current sequence is posted on the Program Review section of the Senate website. The sequence can be altered by action of the UGC. Usually programs will be reviewed every seven years, though circumstances in the interim (such as radical change in a program requiring UGC approval or the need to coordinate with allied graduate program

review) may justify acceleration or delay of reviews.
Program Review is a two-year process. In the first year, the program prepares a self-study and has a site visit by a program review team. In the second year, the administration and program respond to the findings of the review.

Program Review Schedule

Year One	**June 1**: Formal notification of programs to be reviewed **October**: Program Review Committee (PRC) undertakes confidential survey of faculty, students. PRC solicits recommendations for external reviewers from programs, and for internal reviewers from deans and program coordinators **November**: PRC invites review team members **December**: Date for review team visit set **January**: Program self-study due in Senate office on first day of class **March**: Review team visit scheduled **April**: Review team reports received by PRC; when corrections have been received, they are forwarded to UGC **May**: Reports forwarded by UGC to EVC, VPUE, Deans and Program
Year Two	**November**: Program and Dean submit response to Review Team Report to PRC **December**: Implementation plan approved by PRC **January**: Revised strategic plan submitted to Schools. Any programmatic changes submitted to UGC for review **February**: Budget requests to reflect recommendations.

Appendices

I. Program Review Committee 4

II. Program Self-Study 5
a) Executive Summary 5
b) Guidelines for non-majors undergoing Program Review 5
c) Appendices 7

III. Review Team Composition 10

IV. Review Team Guidelines 11
a) Site Visit 12
b) Report 13

V. Response and Follow-up 14

VI. Documents in Program Review File 14

Appendix I - Program Review Committee

The Program Review Committee (PRC) of UGC consists of two members of UGC, and at least three additional members appointed by the Committee on Committees (CoC). Members of the PRC are tenured members of the Academic Senate. Members of the PRC oversee the Program Review process from its initiation to its closure. They normally serve for three years, on staggered terms. The PRC:

- Determines and publishes the schedule of Program Reviews
- Collaborates, as necessary, with GRC to coordinate Program Review when there is a simultaneous review of graduate and undergraduate programs
- Invites reviewers to serve on Program Review teams
- Designs and conducts confidential surveys of students and faculty for each program under review
- Receives the final review team reports and submits them, along with any corrections of fact, to UGC
- Reviews the response of the Program and Dean to the Program Review Report
- Recommends to UGC that the Program Review be closed
- Reviews the implementation of the response plan by programs and administration
- Provides UGC and the Senate Administration Council on Assessment (SACA) with an analysis of the aggregate results and actions of the Program Reviews completed in a given year to be shared with UGC and SACA. Any patterns will be highlighted for future investigation
- Every year, the PRC reviews the last three years of Program Review results; a report on patterns and recurring issues will be shared with UGC and SACA; results for particular schools, if relevant, will be shared with the School Curriculum Committee.

In addition, members of the Program Review Committee serve as Chairs and Coordinators of Program Review teams.

Appendix II - Program Self-Study

The most important part of Program Review is the self-study, which builds upon annual and cyclical assessment of learning outcomes, but should address a much wider range of issues. This is a time to reflect on changing patterns in scholarship, in student demographics, in societal needs, etc., as they pertain to a program's educational goals. Thus, faculty, students, staff, and alumni should be involved in the review.

The undergraduate program to be reviewed is notified at least six months before the upcoming self-study is due. At the time of the notification, the program is asked by the UGC Chair, with a cc to the relevant Dean, to prepare a self-study document which will be transmitted to the external review team. This will become a part of the permanent record of the Program Review and will be filed together with the report of the PRC. The program should direct any questions or dialogue concerning the review to the PRC Chair with a cc to the Senate Analyst. The self-study should concisely present the faculty's thoughtful and thorough evaluation of the program, based on the participation of the program's faculty, staff and students, as well as a wide range of evidence available to determine program strengths and weaknesses. The self-study is submitted electronically both to the PRC Chair and to the Senate Analyst coordinating Program Review.

The self-study consists of two parts, an Executive Summary, and Data Appendices. The Executive Summary should be between 15 and 25 pages, and provide an overview and interpretation of the material covered in the Data Appendices. The study should address the following questions:

I. Introduction: Program Mission, History, Context
II. What do you think you are doing?
III. How are you doing it?
IV. Who is doing it?
V. How well are you doing it?
VI. Future Directions/planning

Most of these are self-explanatory and should be generated internally by the program/unit. Data to support questions III. and IV. can be provided with the assistance of the School Assessment Specialist and staff from the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) who will work with the program and UGC on their preparation.

In the case of non-majors (i.e. General Education, free-standing minors) undergoing Program Review, the Coordinator of the program will meet with the PRC to determine the appropriate focus, as well as data for the review.

The program self-study, other than the Table of Contents, may be organized in a way that makes sense to the program, especially for programs undergoing concurrent accreditation, such as ABET. In cases where undergraduate and graduate program reviews take place simultaneously, the two PRCs will work with the program to determine the proper scope of the self-study. The questions below should serve as prompts, and should be answered as appropriate.

Table of Contents/ Contact Information

I. Introduction
This serves to orient the reader to both the Program itself, and the self-study, and can provide an overview of report, Program Mission, Program History, and internal and external contexts that shape the program. Major changes in the program since the last review or initial program approval should also be highlighted.

II. What do you think you are doing?
How does your program envision its work? This includes program philosophy, program goals, and program learning outcomes (PLOs). What do you want your students to learn, and how do you measure their learning outcomes? How do these relate to School and University missions and goals, including institutional planning documents as relevant? How does the program support General Education? How does your program relate – in mission and goals – to other similar programs?

III. How are you doing it?
This includes curriculum, extra-curricular activities, co-curricular support, advising, recruitment and retention. How do you serve majors? Minors? Non-majors? How do these compare with comparable programs at peer institutions? Are there disciplinary guidelines or best practices that have shaped the curriculum?

IV. Who is doing it?
Overview of faculty, including non-senate lecturers, Senate faculty, and TAs; their qualifications and contributions to the program; their roles in planning and assessment.

V. How well are you doing it, and how do you know?
This section should reflect on the results of annual assessments, the development and effectiveness of the Assessment Plan, and the ways the annual and cyclical assessments have been used to improve student learning, to improve teaching, to improve the learning environment, to improve student support, and to improve curriculum. It may also reflect on the adequacy of institutional support in improving both student learning and assessment itself. It should also draw on relevant student data from IPA that is provided in the appendices, including time to degree, and where possible, disaggregated data on student outcomes (by major, ethnicity, high school, etc.)
This data should be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program.

VI. Future Directions/planning
Summarize main points of current strategic plan, as well as any long-term thinking about the program. The program may wish in this section to suggest possible changes in the assessment plan. Future planning should reflect on enrollment trends in the program, current student/faculty ratios, necessary institutional support, and any other issues that impinge on sustainability. **Note**: if in the course of the self-study a program begins to think about changes to its curriculum, we recommend that these be outlined here, but not submitted to UGC for review until after the site visit has been completed. This section may also include any issue the program wants to bring up that would be

helpful to the review.

Self-Study Data Appendices

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 Senate Analyst will provide one copy of the documents.

Program Administration

a. 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.)
- Administrative support staff

b. Faculty Membership List

Provide a list of the Senate faculty who have held membership in the program for the last three years, their academic titles, and school affiliations (if joint appointments).

Student Information

a. Current Undergraduate Students

Provide a summary of current major and minor enrollments including:

- Class status
- Entering GPA, current GPA, standardized test scores
- Retention, time to degree and GPA for graduating seniors over the past five years for all students and disaggregated by student profiles (gender, race/ethnicity, family background, income, first language, transfer student, etc.); if possible, comparison to national norms
- Diversity: first generation, income, first language, race/ethnicity/ gender, family background, High School API
- Number of double majors, number of students participating in undergraduate research projects, number of students participating in Honors tracks
- Student/faculty ratios
- Enrollment trends.

The appropriate administrative units (e.g. Admissions office, Dean's office, IPA) are responsible for furnishing this information.

b. Alumni

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

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

c. Benchmark Data

A benchmark data report will be provided to the program to be inserted in the self-study. 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.

Admitting and Advising Students

a. Advising Guidelines

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.

Any notices sent to students in the previous year that reference advising guidelines or other information that helps students in the program.

b. 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 and a copy of the approval letter from UGC. If you do not have a copy of these documents contact the PRC and/or Senate 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 of the document as approved by the UGC.

c. 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.

d. 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 place of a letter.
- Include copies of letters and materials used by the School.

Faculty Information

a. Abbreviated CVs

For each faculty member of the undergraduate program, provide an abbreviated CV (two

pages at the most) that covers important career information and more detailed information for the last five years. Provide the following information:

- Name
- Highest degree, institution, year of degree
- Area of expertise (two lines)
- Membership on 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).

Co-curricular and Administrative support (as relevant)

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.

Additional materials
Any additional materials, including information on comparable programs, disciplinary guidelines regarding best practices, that may be of use to the review team and which support the claims of the self-study.

Appendix III - Review Team

The Review Team is chaired by a member of the PRC from UC Merced; it includes one other tenured Senate faculty from UC Merced; and two or three faculty from another peer institution. At least one of those external faculty should be from a UC campus, and one from another peer institution. Suggestions for potential review team members are solicited from the program under review as well as the relevant dean. At least one member of the Review Team will have expertise in assessment. Potential team members will be ranked by the PRC committee. They will be contacted by the PRC member in charge of the review; and when they have accepted, they will be sent an official appointment letter. The Senate Office coordinates the Review Team travel, travel expense reimbursements and honoraria payments.

The Program Review Committee, in consultation with the Deans and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE), formulates a "standard" set of questions that the Review Team may (not "must") use to guide its deliberations; most of the questions are used for all programs, but some are program-specific. These are based on the Review Team Guidelines (see below) but may be more specific. The program is provided with the questions that are sent to the Extramural Team.

About thirty days prior to the scheduled visit, the information from the program self-study and a package of additional information (contents of the package follow below) are sent by the Senate Analyst to each member of the Review Team. Members can request electronic or hard copies of the documents. An identical information package is provided electronically to the members of the Program Review Committee. The program receives a copy of the package of the material without the faculty survey, but with a copy of the student survey from which the identifying questionnaire responses have been redacted for purposes of student/faculty confidentiality. The program does not receive a copy of the faculty survey. The School Dean and Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost receive only redacted copies of the student and faculty survey.

The following items are included in the packets sent to members of the Review Team along with the Program self-study and a cover letter signed by the PRC chair:

1. Tentative schedule for visit
2. Results of confidential surveys of faculty and students
3. Current UCM General Catalog
4. Guidelines and Questions for reviewers

Appendix IV - Review Team Guidelines

UC Merced is interested in your overall assessment of the teaching and research accomplishments and potential of the unit you are reviewing. We are interested in the evaluation of the educational program and assessment practices, as well as comparisons to peer programs. Recommendations to increase resources may follow from your review, but are not in themselves the primary responsibility of the reviewers.

It might be helpful to think of your review with the following questions in mind:

1. Is the undergraduate program coherent in the areas of teaching, counseling, mentoring, and introduction to research for its students? Is it adequate in scope and depth to ensure education is appropriate for the B.A./B.S.? How well does the program align with and demonstrably support UC Merced's mission and goals, including General Education?

2. Are the program goals clear and explicit in regards to what students should be learning in the major, and what skills and knowledge they should be taking away from each course? Is the program meeting its goals?

3. What is the overall quality of the program with respect to the following?

    a. Faculty teaching for both majors and non-majors
    b. Student learning
    c. Student satisfaction

4. Evaluate the program's assessment of undergraduate students' learning outcomes. Is the assessment plan appropriate? Effectively administered? Is it used to improve teaching and learning? Has the program had adequate support in developing and responding to its assessments? The team may also wish to comment on its appraisal of student learning in the program, based on both examples of student work and the program's assessments.

5. Are students provided frequent opportunities to assess their skills and knowledge, and provided feedback to help them reflect on what they have learned and what they still need to learn?

6. How well does this program prepare graduates for careers it says it supports? Would students from the program be viable candidates for graduate programs? Professional programs?

7. Is the faculty quality and breadth of coverage adequate for a strong undergraduate program?

    a. Areas that should (must) be strengthened or added?
    b. Areas that should (must) be de-emphasized or removed?
    c. In which area should the next appointment (resources permitting) be made?

8. In many fields, long-range planning and strategic choices about areas of teaching and research are necessary. Does the program provide an imaginative, workable long-range

9. What would be needed for this program (or some component) to achieve national distinction giving due consideration to present UCM faculty resources compared to those available at top ranked programs elsewhere?

10. Do students feel welcome in the major and is there adequate advising to meet their needs?

11. How do students and faculty feel about class size in relation to program learning objectives? How do they feel about the proportion of classes taught by TA's and non-senate lecturers as opposed to regular faculty? How do students feel about grading standards and the responses they get to written work for their classes?

12. Do the current administrative structures at UCM foster undergraduate education in the program you are reviewing? Are there closely related units, including co-curricular units, at UCM or other UC campuses with which more collaboration should be undertaken? Are there appropriate support facilities such as libraries, teaching and research space, computer labs and training?

13. Is there sufficient interaction between the program and any campus programs with which it should interact?

14. Do students find it reasonable to complete the major on a four-year schedule?

15. Is the program doing enough to recruit high quality students?

16. Are there any questions we have not asked that you feel should be addressed?

We are aware that each program under review presents a special set of circumstances and that your review will need to take these distinctions into account. We intend these guidelines to be suggested topics that you may want to pursue rather than prescriptions of the process. As an External Reviewer, you should feel entirely free to pursue what avenues of investigation will yield constructive and relevant insights into the particular programs. We hope to obtain well thought-out and forthright judgments of where we stand in the academic picture, so that UCM may best capitalize on its strengths and take effective steps to correct weaknesses. The Academic Senate will give serious consideration to whatever directions you believe to be most worthwhile in achieving those ends.

Any questions concerning the review should be directed to the PRC Chair with a c/c to the Senate Analyst.

<u>Review Team Visit</u>
The review team visit is scheduled by the PRC Chair with the assistance of the Senate Analyst. It generally begins with a dinner, followed by a day or day and a half of meetings on campus. The initial dinner should include the Review Team, the PRC Chair, the Dean of the School and/or VPUE, the Program Chair, and a representative of Student Affairs; other

people may be included as appropriate.

The first morning of the visit begins with a meeting with the PRC Chair and UGC Chair, who will outline procedures and note any special issues for the review. Meetings will be scheduled with the Dean and appropriate Associate Dean for the discipline, the VPUE, the EVC, and a representative for Student Affairs. In addition, the Review Team meets with the Program Chair, the coordinator of Undergraduate programs, and with the faculty as a whole. A separate meeting with non-Senate faculty, TAs, and lab staff is also scheduled. Finally, the team meets with students and with faculty from closely related programs. As appropriate, there may be a tour of the facilities.

The final activity of the review team is an exit interview. The team meets with the PRC Chair, the UGC Chair, the Dean, VPUE, and EVC as well as the Program Coordinator to deliver an oral summary of their findings and recommendations.

Review Team Report

The review team is asked to provide an assessment of the quality of faculty, students, and the program; effectiveness of learning outcomes assessment; areas of strengths and weaknesses; advice on areas to remove or strengthen; adequacy of facilities; morale, and any other issues they wish to address. They are also asked to provide recommendations for faculty or programmatic development. While these findings are summarized in the exit interview, the review team is also asked to furnish a written report of approximately 5-10 pages **within four weeks** of their visit. Recommendations for change and future development should be prioritized by level of significance; the review team may, at its discretion, recommend a shorter time between reviews than is usually the case. When the review team report is received, the honoraria are sent to the reviewers.

The review team will submit their report to the PRC and UGC Chair within **one month** of the site visit. A copy will be sent to the Senate Analyst.

V. Follow Up

After the review team report is received, the PRC Chair will send a copy to the program coordinator. The Program Chair will have the opportunity to review the report for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions; any corrections should be submitted to the PRC within two weeks. The PRC will forward the review team report, along with any corrections submitted by the program, to UGC. UGC will receive the report, and forward it to the Chair of the Program, the relevant Dean, the VPUE, the EVC, and any other relevant parties.

Response Phase

In the semester following receipt of the Review Team Report, the program faculty will discuss its recommendations with the Dean and any other relevant people. The program shall seek and collect input from all constituents (faculty, students, and administration) and prepare a detailed response. The program response consists of a narrative response and a detailed action plan, including a revised assessment plan. While the narrative response is the work of the program alone, the action plan may be developed collaboratively with (as appropriate) the Dean, the VPUE, faculty in adjacent programs, and representatives of the PRC or UGC. The action plan should include a timetable and an outline of the resources needed.

The program response, including the action plan, are both approved by the Dean, and submitted to the PRC by the end of November. When the PRC determines that the response adequately addresses the concerns of the report, it proposes to UGC that the Program Review be closed. A Program Review is not closed until the PRC agrees that the response to the review is adequate. If a review is not closed, the PRC and UGC may implement curricular sanctions, and may recommend administrative sanctions to the Dean and EVC. Sanctions may include a moratorium on faculty appointments, undergraduate admissions or other actions.

In the following months, the recommendations will be implemented as appropriate through revisions to the Program Strategic Plan, the Dean's budget requests to the EVC/Provost, and any revisions of policy/ies and program(s) that are submitted to UGC.

CLOSING THE REVIEW: When the program's response has been approved, the PRC will recommend to UGC that the Program Review be closed.

DISTRIBUTION OF CLOSED REVIEW MATERIALS: Copies of the unedited review team report, the program's response, and other pertinent documents shall be sent to the Chancellor, EVC/Provost, College Dean and the UCM Office of the Academic Senate, as well as the Senate-Administration Committee on Assessment (SACA). File copies of these documents, along with the original self-study and the results of the student and faculty surveys, will be stored in the Office of the Academic Senate. A brief summary of the programs reviewed and UGC actions are included in the UGC Annual Report to the Academic Senate, Merced Division.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Undergraduate Program Reviews will be treated with confidentiality until they are closed. The self-study, the review team report, and the final implementation plan are open to examination after the Review is closed. The results of student and faculty surveys are available only in redacted form. Particular documents and sections of the report may be maintained as confidential documents available only as needed for particular reasons

at the request of either the Program or the PRC. Petitions to review confidential material will be reviewed by the PRC.