

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Program Review Procedures	2
Appendix	
A – Universal Transmittal Letter: Charge to the External Review Committee	10
B – Department Self-Study: Current Status; Critical Issues; and Academic Plans	12
C – External Review Committee Meetings: Agenda Model	17
D - Review Timetable: Document Distribution	18

SEPTEMBER 2009

Office of the Vice Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs

http://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/AcadPlan/PgmReview/review_procedures.pdf

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

§1. Objectives

The Santa Cruz campus of the University of California conducts periodic external reviews of all UCSC academic degree programs.¹ Such reviews provide critical assessment of status and direction from the unit itself, from the campus community including administration and Academic Senate, and from external scholars. Program reviews serve as important evidence to accrediting and public agencies that the university is engaged in a continuous program of critical self-examination and evaluation. As importantly, reviews allow departments to examine their current position and the research and educational effectiveness of their programs, raise critical issues within the department, and evaluate their plans for future developments.

§2. Scope

All undergraduate and graduate instructional programs administered by an academic unit² are subject to periodic review. If an academic unit administers an interdisciplinary program or teaches a significant number of service courses for other units, advice from all participating departments and divisions will be sought. The unit under review will produce a self-assessment document which will be considered by the administration and Academic Senate. External scholars in the discipline will visit the campus to discuss the document with the department constituencies. A campus closure meeting and a mid-cycle update are integral components to record and monitor the review outcome.

The review goal is to focus the department faculty members as well as external units and reviewers on the following:

- Current status and effectiveness – Assess scholarly research and creativity, graduate program(s) and undergraduate programs(s).
- Critical issues – Raise one to three critical issues from the department's self-examination of their current status.
- Future plans – Project future development and improvement of instruction and scholarship in the context of the department's current strengths and within foreseeable resources.

§3. Conduct of Review; Roles and Responsibilities

The Vice Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs (VPDAA) is responsible for general oversight of the review process. The VPDAA specifies the annual review cycle, approves

¹ Formal research groups such as Organized Research Units or Multi-Campus Research Units are reviewed elsewhere.

² In this document, the terms academic unit and department are used interchangeably. In all cases, the terms refer to academic organizations that oversee curriculum approved by the Academic Senate's Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate Council.

the slate of reviewers, facilitates communication among participants, participates in review entrance and exit interviews, chairs closure and mid-cycle update meetings, writes closure reports, and informs the Campus Provost-Executive Vice Chancellor and Chancellor.

The overseeing dean is responsible for the day-to-day review management. This responsibility includes notifying the department, distributing universal transmittal letter and the department self-study, nominating and soliciting review committee members, scheduling the external review committee meetings, transmitting the review report, and submitting comments. The dean is responsible for maintaining the review schedule as set by the VPDA.

The department chair, on behalf of the faculty, is responsible for the preparation of the departmental self-study, the response to the review reports, and the preparation of the mid-cycle update.

The Academic Senate committees have three major responsibilities:

1. Reviewing the departmental self-study and submitting written comments and questions regarding specific concerns to the external review committee;
2. Reviewing the review reports and providing written Senate perspective, including re-approval of non-degree programs such as minors and concentrations, at the closure meeting; and
3. Providing questions for the mid-cycle update report.

The Academic Senate and its committees may also take direct action as a result of any aspect of the review consistent with their authorities and responsibilities.

§4. Department Self-Study Document

§4.1 Content

The unit will prepare a document, following the outline in Appendix B, which will consist of three parts, current status, critical issues and strategies, and future plans. As with all documents in the review process, the departmental self-study will be distributed in a specified electronic format.

The first section provides the department's assessment of its current status and effectiveness in four areas:

1. The objectives, overall quality and direction of the research, scholarship and creative activity of the faculty;
2. The objectives, overall quality and direction of the department's graduate program or programs, including educational effectiveness;
3. The objectives, overall quality and direction of the department's undergraduate program or programs, including educational effectiveness;
4. The effective utilization of available resources to the department.

The assessment should be supported by quantitative material provided by the department, the overseeing division or school, and the Office of Planning and Budget.

The second section, building from the department's assessment, should address one to three issues important to the departmental and programmatic development within the coming review cycle. These issues may be specific to one segment of the department's functions, such as the undergraduate or graduate programs, or may crosscut functions, such as the diversity of the department or integrating graduate and undergraduate programs more effectively. Strategies for addressing these issues should be proposed.

The third section addresses the unit's most recent academic planning document(s) and pending proposals for new degree programs and any other review processes (e.g. accreditation). Program reviews should emphasize the department's plans for future development and improvement of instruction and scholarship, in the context of its current strengths and recent accomplishments and within available or foreseeable resource allocations. How these plans relate to the critical issues raised in the second section should be included in the discussion.

§4.2 Distribution

The departmental self-study will be submitted to the dean no later than **May 1** of the year prior to the review visit. The dean will review the document for completeness and to inform the final appointment of the external review committee. The dean will distribute the departmental self-study and universal transmittal letter, along with the dean's supplemental comments, to the Academic Senate and VPDA no later than the immediately following **September 1**. The departmental self-study will be made available to the Academic Senate for comment, discussion of issues raised, and the feasibility and appropriateness of the plans within the campus context. The dean distributes the universal transmittal letter, the departmental self-study, and any supplemental comments received to the review committee **no later than one month** prior to the campus visit.

§5. Review Committee

§5.1 Configuration

The review committee shall be comprised of least three external distinguished scholars and experts in the relevant field of study. At least one member will hold, or will recently have held, a faculty appointment at another University of California campus. In unusual circumstances, exceptions to this policy may be approved by the VPDA.

§5.2 Appointment

In parallel with the completion of the departmental self-study, the department nominates a slate of respected scholars whose standing and expertise would allow them to address those issues and plans raised in the self-study. The overseeing dean may, and perhaps should, add additional nominees and shall formally recommend a final list to the VPDA that includes, at a minimum, the candidates' brief biographies. The candidates should include scholars who are best suited to address the issues raised by the departmental self-

study and supplemental comments and to produce an independent assessment. The VPDAAs approve the list submitted by the dean prior to appointment or contact, formal or informal, of any candidate.

§5.3 Committee Charge

Academic department reviews shall be governed by a charge which includes some general areas of examination and focus the external review committee's attention on the issues raised by the department, Senate committees and campus administration. The charge is incorporated into a universal transmittal letter (Appendix A).

§5.4 Supplemental Comments

Comments on the departmental self-study may be provided by the units participating in the review. Comments from the dean will be transmitted to the campus with the departmental self-study by September 1. Comments from the VPDAAs, VPDGS, VPDUE, or Senate must be received by the dean no later than **November 15** of the year of the review visit and shall be enclosed with the charge and distributed to the review committee. Comments received after November 15 may be enclosed at the dean's discretion if delay does not compromise the review timeline. All comments sent to the dean will be copied to the department chair, Academic Senate office and VPDAAs.

§5.5 Communication

All communication between the department and external reviewers is managed by the dean's office to maintain accountability and ensure appropriate document distribution. All documents provided to external reviewers are considered part of the campus review file and will be made available to all units involved in reviews.

§6. Campus Visit

The overseeing dean is responsible for scheduling the campus visit, including all meetings (see Appendix C). The external review committee shall meet jointly with the dean and the VPDAAs in an entrance interview prior to meeting with members of the department.

Following the entrance interview, the review committee shall meet, at a minimum, with the following representatives (in no particular order):

- Faculty (individuals or groups as appropriate);
- Faculty Undergraduate Committee;
- Faculty Graduate Committee;
- Undergraduate Students;
- Graduate students;
- Postdoctoral fellows;
- Chairs of departments served by the unit (where relevant); and
- Senior staff representative(s)

Two exit interviews shall be scheduled:

1. Dean; and
2. CP/EVC and VPDA.

It is good practice to set aside at least an hour and a half on each day of the visit for the team to prepare the draft report.

§7. Review Committee Report

The dean shall ask the review committee to electronically submit a report within four weeks of their visit. The report should address the charge; any supplemental comments received, and should be based upon the departmental self-study and the interviews.

§8. Action on the Report

§8.1 External Reviewers' Report

The review committee's report shall be submitted to the overseeing dean. The dean is responsible for immediately distributing copies to the department chair, the VPDA, VPDGS, VPDUE and the Academic Senate Office.

§8.2 Department's Response

The chair is responsible for immediately distributing the report to all Senate faculty (and, optionally, non-Senate faculty) and senior staff. The department shall submit to the dean a written response to the review report within four weeks. If the chair's report does not represent department consensus, faculty minority reports may also be submitted at the discretion of individual faculty members. Department response deadline's falling in summer will be extended into fall quarter, treating summer as a void and beginning the clock at the start of fall quarter.

§8.3 Overseeing Dean's Response

Within two weeks of receiving the departmental response (including any minority reports), the dean shall prepare the divisional or school response and submit it, with the departmental response, to the VPDA, VPDGS, VPDUE, and the Academic Senate office.

§8.4 Academic Senate Committee Response

The Graduate Council, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Planning and Budget will be asked to review the external review report and the departmental and divisional responses, and provide written comments to the VPDA. Comments from other Senate committees may be submitted at the discretion of the Senate. Senate comments should include recommendations for questions or action items to be incorporated into the department's mid-cycle update report. Senate committees are asked to issue re-approval of non-degree programs such as concentrations or minors prior to the closure meeting.

§8.5 Closure Meeting

The VPDAAs office is responsible for scheduling the closure meeting upon receipt of the departmental and divisional responses. The closure meeting will be scheduled no earlier than six weeks following receipt of the dean's response, allowing time for Senate committees to prepare their respective comments. The closure meeting is chaired by the VPDAAs and will ordinarily include:

- Department chair;
- Overseeing dean;
- Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
- Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education;
- CEP, GC, CPB representatives as assigned by their respective committees; and
- Vice Provost of Academic Affairs

The closure meeting will provide an opportunity for a candid discussion of the results of the external review. Specifically, the following matters shall be addressed:

- Factual matters that are in dispute;
- Perspective on current priorities and future directions as viewed by each agency;
- Prospects for achieving the review recommendations; and
- Senate re-approval of non-degree programs such as minors and concentrations.

§8.6 Closure Report

The conclusions reached in the course of the discussion shall be summarized in a closure report written by the VPDAAs within one month of the meeting. The closure report shall normally include a list of questions and/or action items addressing any outstanding concerns raised in the review and the various responses. With the mutual concurrence of the administration and the relevant Senate committees, the questions may be omitted.

The VPDAAs shall transmit the closure report to the Campus Provost-Executive Vice Chancellor, with copies to the Chancellor, relevant units and Academic Senate. The department chair shall make the report available to all department faculty members.

§9. Implementation and Mid-Cycle Update Report

The overseeing dean shall implement or otherwise address recommended actions and monitor conditions placed by Senate committees and/or the administration on the department. No later than two years subsequent to the closure report, the department chair shall prepare a response to the specific questions appended to the closure letter. Chairs shall consult with relevant faculty constituencies in preparing the response. The dean shall submit the department's mid-cycle update report to the VPDAAs with copies to the department, VPDGS, VPDUE, and Academic Senate.

Contingent on concerns addressed in the mid-cycle update report, the VPDAAs recommends to the Senate if the department's subsequent review schedule is on a six or eight year cycle. Senate committees may decide to exercise control of curriculum, at this

time. If concerns by the dean, VPDAA, and/or Academic Senate are unaddressed; the next department review may be accelerated. A mid-cycle review meeting may be convened if the current status of the unit needs immediate discussion. This meeting may be requested by the Academic Senate or the VPDAA and shall include the departmental chair, divisional dean, and Senate Committee representatives who wish to participate. The VPDAA shall chair the meeting and prepare a written report to the EVC/Provost summarizing recommendations.

§10. Timetable

The review process shall be completed in a timely way to ensure prompt attention to areas of concern. To achieve this, all units involved are expected to manage their respective roles and responses within the prescribed timelines (Appendix D). The VPDAA may convene the closure meeting without receiving unit responses if deemed necessary to maintain an effective timetable.

§11. Scheduling Reviews

All academic departments and degree programs will be reviewed regularly every six to eight years. The duration of the review cycle will be determined by the VPDAA contingent on the mid-cycle update and Senate consultation. New degree programs will be asked to provide interim self-assessments three years after their establishment, and subsequently will be incorporated into their administering department's review schedule. Interdisciplinary degree programs not administered by a department may be reviewed autonomously as determined when the program is established. The VPDAA's office will transmit an updated review schedule at the beginning of fall quarter.

Suggestions for procedural improvements that improve the overall usefulness of reviews, or that reduce workload without compromising value, may be submitted to the VPDAA at any time. Subsequent changes to review procedures will be announced with the annual fall quarter schedule transmittal.

In isolated cases where there is a justifiable need to defer, accelerate, or otherwise reschedule an external review, the department chair will make a written request to the overseeing dean that sets out the justification for deferment or acceleration. Requests for deferral or acceleration may also originate with the dean or the VPDAA. Rescheduling may be justified by potential accreditation scheduling conflicts with external agencies such as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) or the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The dean will forward the request in writing, together with his or her independent opinion and recommendation, to the VPDAA. Deferral requests should be submitted to the VPDAA no later than October 15 of the year prior to the campus visit. The VPDAA will consider such requests on their merits, consult with the relevant Academic Senate Committees (CPB, CEP and/or Graduate Council), take into account the institutional need to maintain the regularity and timeliness of the review process, and will make the final determination regarding whether and how the review will be scheduled.

The campus practice is to treat external review materials as confidential³ and release them only to those with a business need to know. However, all such matters are subject to discovery under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) so should be written with this in mind. It is recommended any initial request for documents from UCSC employees not directly involved in the external review be justified with a business reason. Justified requests should be reviewed and approved by the dean, chair, or VPDA before releasing materials. Consult with the following office if you receive any review document requests based on freedom of information under the California Public Records Act (CPRA).

Information Practices Specialist and Policy Coordination Office
Office of the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
voice: 831.459.4003
fax: 831.459.2760

³ Per UCSC policy definitions <http://security.ucsc.edu/policies/glossary.shtml#c>

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSAL TRANSMITTAL LETTER CHARGE TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Dear [Name]:

Thank you very much for agreeing to review the _____ Department/Program⁴ at the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California. The department oversees the following instructional programs⁵:

- Undergraduate Minor, BA/BS
- Graduate Certificate/Paranetical/MA/MFA/MS/PhD

To inform your review, we enclose the department's self-study. The department was asked to prepare a document that reviews their current status, identifies critical issues and strategies to address them, and integrates these with its future academic plans. The appendices include supporting data along with previous review reports, and other information that may be helpful to you. Also attached are comments of the dean, campus administration, and Academic Senate committees.

The review process at UCSC is envisioned as a means to address not only the current stature of the department and programs but also future aspirations. Your counsel is sought:

- to assess whether the critical issues raised are the most important;
- to advise if the strategies and solutions presented by the department are feasible and optimize effectiveness; and
- to assess whether the academic plans are promising.

We would also appreciate your candid assessment as to the current quality of the department: Are the undergraduate and graduate courses and degree requirements appropriate? Is it of national or international status, or a top UC program, and, if not, how could such rating be achieved?

We greatly appreciate the time and effort that it takes to serve on such a review panel, and we are very grateful to you for agreeing to join us. The importance of the external review process to the UC Santa Cruz campus cannot be overstated, and we will take your report very seriously. We request that we receive your final report electronically within four weeks of your visit to the campus.

With best regards,

⁴ If an Interdisciplinary program is being reviewed autonomously from a department, edit the transmittal letter appropriately.

⁵ List all instructional programs and their associated degrees, including interdisciplinary programs in which the department has affiliations. Include combined majors and minors.

Dean

Enclosures:

Department/Program Self-Study

Supplemental Comments

Cc: Department Chair

Vice Provost, Dean of Academic Affairs

Vice Provost, Dean of Undergraduate Education

Vice Provost, Dean of Graduate Studies

Planning & Budget Analyst

Academic Senate Office

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT SELF-STUDY: CURRENT STATUS; CRITICAL ISSUES; AND ACADEMIC PLANS

The department shall provide a narrative, not to exceed 30 pages, followed by appendices. The narrative shall be organized into three sections, each approximately ten pages. The narrative should respond to data provided to the department such as student surveys and graduate program statistics.

- I. Department current status and program effectiveness, including
 - A. Faculty research, scholarship, creative activity;
 - B. Graduate program or programs;
 - C. Undergraduate program or programs; and
 - D. Administrative staffing, equipment, and space.
- II. Critical issues facing the department and the strategies through which the department intends to address these issues.
- III. Future academic plans including new programs, research foci, entrepreneurial efforts, outreach, or other components.

The self-study should be prepared in an electronic format. Copies will be posted on a secured web site and made available to administrative and senate members as appropriate.⁶

I. CURRENT STATUS

A. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Direction

Describe the present direction of the department's research, scholarship, and creative activity, addressing the following questions:

- What are the department's current particular intellectual strengths in relation to nationally ranked public and private research universities? Are there any unique aspects to the department?
- What entrepreneurial efforts has the department taken? Include activity to generate resources and cross-unit collaborations.
- How are faculty members mentored with respect to curricular, research and administrative issues?

B. Graduate Program

Describe the present and planned philosophy of the graduate degree program, including parenthetical, collaborative, or interdisciplinary programs, addressing the following:

- Is the department satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curricular offerings? Are there any unique aspects of the graduate program?

⁶ The self-study should be distributed in electronic format. Current format is PDF. Contact staff for procedural questions is Betsy Moses, bmoses@ucsc.edu.

- What are the educational objectives of your graduate programs and how are they assessed?
- Describe the philosophy and structure of qualifying and candidacy examinations.
- Describe the overall quality, size, and diversity of the graduate student cohort.
- What are the department's conclusions regarding the graduate major survey?
- Is the size of the student cohort limited by financial support, by the numbers and quality of applicants, by available faculty resources for supervision, or by some other constraint?
- Describe the program's standards for a successful post-degree job placement. Please describe the TA training program. How is it assessed, and is the program successful?

C. Undergraduate Program

Briefly describe the philosophy and structure of the undergraduate program's core Bachelor's degree programs. How are minors and any honors, intensive majors, or combined majors related to the core degree programs? If there are defined concentrations within the major, explain their intended purpose and structure.

For the core Bachelor's degree programs, answer the following questions:

- What are the educational objectives (or student learning outcomes) of the degree programs? Where are they published?
- How does the faculty assess whether students graduating from the program regularly achieve those objectives? How does the program's comprehensive exit requirement or other "capstone" experience provide evidence that graduating students achieve the program's major learning outcomes?
- How are the educational objectives of service or general education courses defined and communicated to students? What policies and practices ensure that placement standards, course content, grading standards, and assessment of student learning are uniform across multiple offerings of the course with different instructors?
- Provide an example since the last review of an improvement made to improve some aspect of the program's curriculum or course effectiveness. What stimulated the faculty to make the change? What evidence did they use to guide the development or assessment of the effectiveness of the improvement?
- What are the faculty's conclusions based upon the information provided in the undergraduate major survey?
- How are students advised and mentored for success in the program? What measures of student satisfaction or evidence of student learning do faculty use to monitor the effectiveness of the program?
- Please describe any other aspects of the undergraduate program, such as outreach, tutoring, internships, or other support activities, that the faculty believe contribute to student success in the program.

Based upon the responses to these questions, for each of your degree programs provide brief responses to the questions in the appended table of “Educational Effectiveness Indicators.” These will be published as part of the campus’s required report to WASC for accreditation purposes.

D. Postdoctoral Program

- What is the importance and purpose of postdoctoral fellows in this field?
- What are the objectives, philosophy, and vision for the postdoctoral program?
- Provide assessment metrics for the postdoctoral program and conclusions.
- What factors limit the postdoctoral program size?
- Describe postdoctoral mentoring and advising programs.
- How does the department assess postdoctoral morale, intellectual atmosphere, and faculty contact?
- Describe postdoctoral participation in department governance.
- Describe postdoctoral opportunities for teaching and mentoring.
- What are the largest issues facing the postdoctoral program?
- Describe department goals for strengthening the postdoctoral program during the next review period.

E. Administrative Staffing, Equipment, and Space

Please address the adequacy of administrative support resources, including staffing, equipment, instructional technology, and space.

II. CRITICAL ISSUES AND STRATEGIES

The department should identify one to three critical issues that they plan to address during the coming review cycle. These issues may be ones that focus on aspects of the faculty research, graduate or undergraduate programs (i.e. fall within one of the categories cited above), or may crosscut these categories. Examples of the latter category would be to increase diversity throughout the department or to reorient the focus of the department to meet changes within the discipline.

The departmental discussion should include two parts: 1) the identification of the problem, scope and ramifications of the issue, and supporting evidence; and 2) a strategy by which the department plans to address this issue. Although the department should bear in mind the available resources, this is also an opportunity to present arguments for funding adjustments. Departmental initiatives to generate external funding should also be presented.

III. FUTURE ACADEMIC PLANS

Briefly discuss departmental plans that have been submitted for divisional/school and campus academic planning processes. Include any anticipated changes in the direction, timing, or phasing. If department plans or alterations are in response to the issues raised in Section 2, discuss the resulting impacts. Briefly summarize specific proposals under

development for new undergraduate or graduate programs. You may reference the actual planning documents and new degree proposals which are appended (see below).

APPENDICES

The Department will provide Appendices I through III. The Office of Planning and Budget will coordinate or provide data for Appendix IV.

Appendix I – Overall Department Profile

- A curriculum vitae for each Senate and recurring faculty member who has held an appointment in the past three years, including employment, education, professional competence and activity, and published writings and creative activities. This should omit teaching history and may be produced by any method the department prefers. Methods suggested include: The Academic Human Resources on-line biobib/cv system; comprehensive faculty website addresses; or faculty prepared cvs. (do not append biobibs)
- Total departmental extramural research funding proposed and awarded (public and private) by year for the past six years. The Office of Sponsored Projects will provide a baseline report which may be augmented by the department.
- List of external seminar and colloquium speakers for the past three years.
- History of department chair appointments (at least since the previous review) and plans for succession.
- Department instructional workload policy.
- Operational and Temporary Academic Staffing budgets including carry-forward funds for three years. Summarize budgets by broad categories such as staff FTE, supplies/expenses, course relief, TA/readers, other as needed to present a one page three year overview of department funds.
- Course offerings over three years including course number and enrollments. A CLP generated report or department preferred format.
- Academic Plan most recently submitted for division/school or campus planning.
- Faculty recruitment plan (intellectual areas, level of appointment, schedule).
- Proposals pending for new degree programs.
- External review report from previous review.
- Campus closure report from previous review.
- Department mid-cycle report from previous review.
- Accreditation self-study and review report, if applicable.

Appendix II - Graduate Program Profile (for each autonomous degree)

- Graduate catalog copy website address.
- Course syllabi file location or website address.
- Retention statistics and time to degree norm.
- Graduate Major Profile (10 yr. history):
 - Thesis title;
 - Principal advisor;
 - Year of degree award;
 - Job placement.

Appendix III: Undergraduate Program Profile

- Undergraduate catalog copy website address.
- Course syllabi file location or website address.
- Senior thesis students, titles, faculty supervisors (six yr. history).
- Student internships (two year history).
- Student research (*e.g.* publications, posters, reports) (two year history).
- Student distribution among programs not consistently captured in campus data systems such as minors, honors majors, intensive majors, Bachelor/Graduate programs, and concentrations.
- Student participation in EAP, UC-DC, other.
- WASC Educational Effectiveness Indicators table

Appendix IV: Postdoctoral Program

- Number of fellows by year since previous review.
- Sources of support (fellowships, external grants, other)
- Salaries and comparison to salaries elsewhere
- Facilities (offices, equipment, labs, computing, library, lounge)

Appendix V: Statistics and Student Surveys

(Provided or coordinated by the Office of Planning & Budget)

- Most recent NRC ranking of ladder faculty and Ph.D. program.
- Ladder Faculty historical roster and demographic distribution.
- Total enrollments and student/faculty workload ratio history.
- Ladder faculty course load and enrollments history.
- Headcount majors history and degrees conferred by Senate faculty.
- Headcount majors history by gender.
- Headcount majors history by ethnicity.
- Undergraduate major survey data
- Graduate major survey data
- Graduate student support history
- Graduate student recruitment history
- Graduate student retention table

APPENDIX C

EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETINGS - AGENDA MODEL

The overseeing dean is responsible for scheduling the campus visit, including all meetings per campus guidelines. Where a department administers an interdisciplinary program, advice from all participating departments/divisions should be sought. Time appropriate to each meeting is estimated.

Meeting	Total Hours	Required Participants	Notes
Entrance Interview	0.5	Dean, VPDAA	
In no particular order	5.0	Ladder faculty	Individuals or groups as appropriate As necessary If applicable Immediately prior to exit interviews
	0.5	Faculty Undergraduate Committee	
	0.5	Faculty Graduate Committee	
	0.75	Undergraduate Students	
	0.75	Graduate Students	
	0.5	Postdoctoral fellows	
	0.5	Chairs of departments served	
	0.5	Senior staff representative	
	1.0	Instructional Support Staff	
	1.0	Day 1 – Review committee alone Day 2 – Review committee alone	
Exit interviews	1.0	Dean	
	1.0	CP/EVC, VPDAA	
TOTAL Hours	13.5		

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The External Review Committee should not be split if at all possible.
- Time should be scheduled for the review committee to meet daily in executive session to prepare the report.
- It is very useful to schedule an executive session for the reviewers after the final exit interviews.
- The division or school is responsible for providing staffing, word processing, and other support as requested.
- The time required is contingent on the size and complexity of the department. The dean may schedule more than two days as necessary.
- All Senate faculty appointed to the unit under review shall have the opportunity to participate in at least one meeting with the review committee.
- A brief walking tour of key physical facilities is appropriate.

APPENDIX D
REVIEW TIMETABLE – DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION

Eight-Year Cycle	Date	Responsible	Recipient	Copied
Year 1 – Prior to Review Visit F - Notify department, solicit nominations for review committee FWS – Prepare departmental self-study FW – VPDAA meets with dept re: IR data FW - Provide data reports for appendices S – Submit departmental self-study and reviewer nominations S – Request approval of reviewer nominations S- Approve reviewer nominations	May 1	Dean Department VPDAA P&B Department Dean VPDAA	Dept. Dept Dept Dean VPDAA Dean	VPDAA, Analyst VPDAA, Dean Dept., Analyst Dept., Analyst
Year 2 – The Review F – Dept. self-study, charge, and supplemental dean’s comments F – Supplemental comments FW – Distribute self-study and comments to review committee WS – External review team visit S – External review report submitted S – External review report distributed S – Departmental response S/Su – Dean’s response (with Dept. response attached)	Sept 1 Nov. 15 1 mo prior 4 weeks Immediate 4 weeks 2 weeks	Dean VPDAA, VPDUE, VPDGS, Senate Dean Dean Reviewers Dean Dean Department Dean	VPDAA Dean Reviewers Dean Dept. Dean VPDAA	All parties All parties All parties All parties
Year 3 F – Senate responses and re-approval of minors and concentrations. FW – Closure meeting WS – Closure report/mid-cycle update questions	6 weeks 4 weeks	CEP, GC, CPB VPDAA VPDAA	VPDAA CP/EVC	All parties All parties All parties
Year 4				
Year 5 – Mid-Cycle Update – deadline published in the review closure report. Planning and Budget provides updated quantitative reports as requested. Department prepares and Dean distributes Mid-cycle update report to VPDAA, all parties copied. VPDAA recommends if the department review is on a 6 or 8 year cycle, or accelerated. Opportunity for Senate recommendations and re-approval of minors and concentrations. VPDAA conducts meeting if necessary				

All Parties copied = All campus units directly involved in external reviews.

(VPDAA, VPDUE, VPDGS, Dean, Department Chair, Academic Senate Office, Planning & Budget analyst)

Internal correspondence regarding external reviews is expected to be via e-mail with pdf attachments.

The September 1 self-study distribution to campus may be e-mailed or delivered on a cd/rom to the Planning & Budget Analyst who will post the materials for administration and Senate review.