ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Changes made:
- Slight revision to charge letter (Appendix A) language

SEPTEMBER 2017

Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

http://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/external-review/index.html

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, evaluation, and improvement. 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 future plans.

§2. Scope

All undergraduate and graduate instructional programs administered by an academic unit[2] are subject to periodic review. If an academic unit administers an interdepartmental 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 that 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 and strategic plans – Raise one to three critical issues from the department's self-examination of their current status, and discuss strategies to address these issues.

§3. Conduct of Review; Roles and Responsibilities

The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) is responsible for general oversight of the review process. The VPAA specifies the annual review cycle, approves 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 (CP/EVC).

The overseeing dean is responsible for the day-to-day review management. This responsibility includes notifying the department or interdepartmental program faculty, distributing universal transmittal letter and the department self-study, nominating and soliciting External Review Committee (ERC) members, scheduling the ERC meetings, transmitting the review report, and submitting comments. The dean is responsible for maintaining the review schedule as set by the VPAA.

---

[1] Specialized research centers including Organized Research Units or Multi-campus Research Programs and Initiatives 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 department chair or unit head, 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 ERC;
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 two parts: current status; and critical issues and strategic 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 quality, effectiveness, and direction in three primary areas:
1. Research, scholarship and creative activity of the department faculty;
2. The department's graduate program(s);
3. The department's undergraduate program(s);

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 progress within the coming review cycle. These issues may be specific to one segment of the department's functions, such as established or planned 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 within available resources should be proposed. Strategies should emphasize the department's plans for development and improvement of scholarship, instruction and learning outcomes assessment, in the context of its current strengths and recent accomplishments and within available or foreseeable resource allocations.

§4.2 Interdepartmental Program Self-Study Document
Review procedures for interdepartmental programs are described in their charter and are normally incorporated into the review of their administering department or conducted autonomously.[3]

Interdepartmental program external reviews conducted autonomously will follow the campus procedures for academic units, in parallel with department reviews, and prepare a self-study document following the outline in Appendix B. For interdepartmental program reviews

---

[3] Interdepartmental programs are defined by an administrative charter.

incorporated with their administering department's review, the department chair will request each program director to prepare a streamlined self-study document following the outline in Appendix C.

Given that interdepartmental programs vary significantly in size, scope, and alignment, deans may propose alternative review procedures. Proposed alternatives must be transmitted to the VPAA **by October 15** of the year the self-study is prepared. VPAA approval of any modified process is required.

§4.3 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 ERC.

No later than **September 1 of the year of review**, the dean shall distribute the departmental self-study, the universal charge and transmittal letter, and divisional supplemental comments to the Academic Senate and VPAA, copying the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies (VPDGS) and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The departmental self-study will be made available in the online review portal to the Academic Senate and administration for comment, discussion of issues raised, and the feasibility and appropriateness of the plans within the campus context.

The dean shall distribute the universal transmittal letter, the departmental self-study, and any supplemental comments received from Senate committees and central administration to the ERC **no later than one month** prior to the campus visit.

§5. External Review Committee

§5.1 Configuration
The ERC shall be comprised of at 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, including program scope or size, exceptions to this policy may be proposed by the overseeing dean and approved by the VPAA.

§5.2 Appointment
In parallel with the submission of the self-study **no later than May 1** of the year prior to the review visit, the department nominates to the overseeing dean a slate of respected scholars that includes, at a minimum, the candidates' brief biographies, or links to candidates' professional webpages where credentials and research focus are included. The list of candidates should include scholars whose standing and expertise are best suited to address the issues raised by the self-study and supplemental comments, and to produce an independent assessment.

The overseeing dean may, and perhaps should, add additional nominees and shall formally recommend a final list to the VPAA. The VPAA approves the list submitted by the dean prior to appointment or contact, formal or informal, of any ERC candidate.

§5.3 Committee Charge and Supplemental Questions
Academic reviews shall be governed by a charge that includes some general areas of examination and supplemental questions that focus the ERC'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).

The universal charge and transmittal letter *and* supplemental questions from the overseeing dean shall be transmitted to the campus with the self-study by September 1. Supplemental questions may be incorporated into the universal charge and transmittal letter, at the discretion of the dean.

Units participating in the review may provide comments on the self-study, and deans overseeing programs related to the unit or program under review may also choose to add supplemental questions. Supplemental questions from the VPAA, VPDGS, VPDUE, or Senate must be received by the dean **no later than November 15** of the year of review.

All supplemental questions shall be enclosed with the universal charge and transmittal letter and distributed to the ERC. 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 overseeing dean shall be copied to the department chair, Academic Senate office and VPAA.

§5.5 Communication
All communication between the department and ERC members is managed by the overseeing dean's office to maintain accountability and ensure appropriate document distribution. All documents provided to ERC 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 D). The ERC shall meet jointly with the dean and the VPAA in an entrance interview prior to meeting with members of the department.

Following the entrance interview, the ERC 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:
- Dean; and
- CP/EVC and VPAA.

The division or school is responsible for providing staffing and other support as requested. All senate faculty appointed to the unit under review shall have the opportunity to participate in at least one meeting with the ERC. Members of the ERC should not be separated unless necessary.

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

§7. Review Committee Report

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

§8. Action on the Review Report

§8.1 ERC's Review Report
The ERC's report shall be submitted to the overseeing dean. The dean is responsible for <u>immediate</u> distribution to the department chair, copying the VPAA, VPDGS, VPDUE and the Academic Senate Office.

§8.2 Department's Response
The chair is responsible for immediate distribution 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. 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.

If the chair's report does not represent department consensus, faculty minority reports may also be submitted at the discretion of individual faculty members.

§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 department's response, to the VPAA, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies (VPDGS), Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE), and the Academic Senate office.

§8.4 Academic Senate Committee Response
The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), and Graduate Council (GC) will be asked to review the external review report and the departmental and divisional responses, and provide written comments to the VPAA. 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 VPAA's 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 VPAA and will ordinarily include:
- Department chair;
- Overseeing dean;
- VPDGS;
- VPDUE;
- CEP, CPB, GC representatives as assigned by their respective committees; and
- VPAA and designated staff.

Requests for additional participants should be made to the VPAA.

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 VPAA 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 VPAA shall transmit the closure report to the CP/EVC 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 any 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 VPAA with a copy to the department. The VPAA transmits the mid-cycle update to the VPDGS, VPDUE, and Academic Senate.

Contingent on concerns addressed in the mid-cycle update report, the VPAA recommends to the Senate the schedule for the department's subsequent review, on a six to eight year cycle. Senate committees may decide to exercise control of curriculum at this time. If concerns by the dean, VPAA, and/or Academic Senate have not been sufficiently addressed, 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 VPAA and shall include the departmental chair, divisional dean, and Senate Committee representatives who wish to participate. The VPAA 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 E). The VPAA 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 VPAA 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.

Reviews of interdepartmental degree programs may be incorporated with their administering department's review, conducted autonomously, or follow a modified process approved by the VPAA in consultation with the overseeing dean. The program review procedures are identified when programs are established. The VPAA may reassign an interdepartmental program's review process at the recommendation of the dean to best fit the specific program.

The VPAA'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 VPAA 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 VPAA. 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 VPAA. Deferral requests should be submitted **no later than October 15 of the year prior to the campus visit**. The VPAA 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.

§12. Confidentiality of Documents

The campus practice is to treat external review materials as confidential[4] 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 campus 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 VPAA before releasing materials. Consult with the following office if you receive any review document requests based on freedom of information under 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

---

[4] Per UCSC policy definitions http://security.ucsc.edu/policies/glossary.shtml#c

APPENDIX A
UNIVERSAL CHARGE AND TRANSMITTAL LETTER

The following text for the universal charge and transmittal letter should be modified to include all instructional programs and their associated degrees, including combined majors, concentrations, minors, designated emphases, and certificate programs. If an Interdepartmental program is being reviewed autonomously, edit the transmittal letter appropriately. The overseeing dean's supplemental questions may be incorporated into the text, at the discretion of the dean.

Dear [Name]:

Thank you very much for agreeing to review the _____ Department at the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California. The department oversees the following instructional programs:
- Undergraduate Minor/Bachelor Degree [include combined majors]
- Graduate Certificate/Designated Emphasis/Master's Degree/Doctoral Degree

The review process at UC Santa Cruz 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, degree requirements, learning outcomes and assessment plans appropriate? Does the department's research program(s) have a national or international reputation, or is it a top UC program, and, if not, how could such rating be achieved?

To inform your review, we enclose the department's self-study *[or reference URL, if applicable]*. The department was asked to prepare this document that reviews their current status and identifies critical issues and strategies to address them. The following appendices include supporting data along with the previous review report and other information you may wish to consult in aid of your review. Also attached are comments of the dean, campus administration, and Academic Senate committees. Please read the self-study and the supplemental questions in advance of your visit; the appendices are supporting material that is available should you need additional information after reading the self-study.

We request that we receive your final report electronically within four weeks of your visit to the campus.

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 UC Santa Cruz cannot be overstated, and we will take your report very seriously.

With best regards,
Dean

Enclosures: Department Self-Study
            Supplemental Comments
Cc: Department Chair
            Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
            Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
            Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
            Planning & Budget Assistant Director of Academic Planning and Resources
            Academic Senate Office

APPENDIX B
DEPARTMENT SELF-STUDY:
CURRENT STATUS; CRITICAL ISSUES AND STRATEGIC PLANS

The department shall provide a narrative, <u>not to exceed 25 pages</u> (shorter is encouraged), followed by appendices. The narrative shall be organized into two sections, and be supported by evidence, including the department's own learning outcomes assessment, as well as student surveys and program statistics.

This format shall also be used by interdepartmental programs reviewed autonomously from any department. If an interdepartmental program is reviewed concurrently with a department, please use the format in Appendix C.

I. Department current status and program effectiveness, including
    A. Faculty research, scholarship, creative activity;
    B. Graduate program(s);
    C. Undergraduate program(s); and
    D. Administrative staffing, equipment, and space.
II. Critical issues and the strategies through which the department intends to address these issues within available or foreseeable resources.

The context for learning outcomes assessment is that of self-improvement and quality assurance. The goal is to see a department using assessment to drive self-improvement of student learning. A department will be reviewed for effective use of the process, not on attainment of outcomes. External reviewers may provide a useful perspective in developing additional suggestions for pedagogical or structural changes to improve student learning.

The self-study should be prepared in an electronic format (currently as a single pdf document, appropriately bookmarked). The document transmitted to the VPAA will be posted on a secured web site and made available to administrative and Senate members as appropriate for internal review and supplemental comments.

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?
- If applicable to the department, what are the objectives, philosophy, and vision for the postdoctoral program? Describe mentoring and advising provided by the faculty, and how the department assesses postdoctoral morale.

B. Graduate Program
Describe the present and planned philosophy of the graduate degree program, including designated emphasis, 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?
- Describe the philosophy and structure of qualifying and candidacy examinations.
- What are the program learning outcomes of your graduate degree programs? Where are they published?
- Provide a brief description of the learning outcomes assessment process, including a multiyear assessment plan, references to assessment instruments provided in Appendix II (e.g., QE and dissertation defense rubrics), and a summary of the annual assessment findings regarding each of the program learning outcomes (as many as have been assessed to date). Comment on what the indirect evidence from the graduate student survey, such as students' self-reported competency levels and satisfaction with educational experience, indicates in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. How do measures of direct evidence of student learning agree with indirect measures?
- Overall, how has program assessment (including all steps: defining the program learning outcomes, developing the curriculum matrix or rubrics, interpreting the findings) been used to guide improvement of the program? Provide at least one example since the last review of an improvement made to some aspect of the program's curriculum or course effectiveness.
- Describe the overall quality, size, and diversity of the graduate student cohort. What is the potential student capacity of the doctoral and/or masters programs? Is the size of the student cohorts (doctoral and masters) 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, including possible non-academic placements.
- What are the department's conclusions regarding the graduate student survey?

For any offered designated emphasis or concentration, answer the following questions:
- Is the department satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curriculum for each offered designated emphasis or concentration? For each concentration, what are its unique aspects?
- Are curricular offerings sufficient to meet the demand for each offered designated emphasis or concentration? What has been the demand for each offered designated emphasis or concentration?

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 each core Bachelor's degree program, answer the following questions:
- What are the program learning outcomes of the degree programs?
- Provide a brief description of the learning outcomes assessment process, including a multiyear assessment plan, references to assessment instruments provided in Appendix III (e.g., a capstone rubric), and a summary of the annual assessment findings regarding each of the program learning outcomes (as many as have been assessed to date). Comment on what the indirect evidence from the UCUES survey, such as students' self-reported competency levels and satisfaction with educational experience, indicates in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. How do measures of direct evidence of student learning agree with indirect measures?

- Overall, how has program assessment (including all steps: defining the program learning outcomes, developing the curriculum matrix or rubrics, interpreting the findings) been used to guide improvement of the program? Provide at least one example since the last review of an improvement made to some aspect of the program's curriculum or course effectiveness.
- What are the faculty's conclusions based upon the information provided in the undergraduate major (UCUES) survey?
- 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.

For any minor, major concentration, and combined major, answer the following questions:
- Is the department satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curriculum for each minor, concentration, or combined major? For each concentration, what are its unique aspects?
- Are curricular offerings sufficient to meet the demand for each minor, concentration, or combined major? What has been the demand for each minor, concentration, or combined major?

D.   Administrative Staffing, Equipment, and Space
Briefly describe the administrative support resources, including staffing, equipment, instructional technology, and space.

II.   CRITICAL ISSUES AND STRATEGIC PLANS

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, including plans to start or end instructional programs, or may crosscut these categories. Examples of the latter would be to increase diversity throughout the department or to reorient the focus of the department to meet changes within the discipline.

The 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 within available or foreseeable resources. Initiatives to generate external funding should also be presented. You may reference any actual planning documents, or proposals for new degrees that are included in appendix I.

APPENDICES

Unless noted, 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. Link to a comprehensive faculty website address on the department home page, or a list of individual faculty links, that provides information on employment, education, current research focus, and recent published writings and creative activities for each Senate and recurring faculty member who has held an appointment in the past three years.

B. Total departmental extramural research funding proposed and awarded (public and private) by year since the last review (typically six to eight years). The Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) will provide a baseline report; departments may augment this report with data not captured by OSP.

C. History of department chair appointments (at least since the previous review) and plans for succession.

D. Department instructional workload policy.

E. Course offerings over three years including course number and enrollments. Planning & Budget will provide a baseline report from the Seven Year Aggregated Course Enrollments report; the departments may choose to provide the same data in their own department preferred format.

F. Faculty recruitment plan (intellectual areas, level of appointment, schedule).

G. Previous review: external review report, campus closure report, and department mid-cycle report.

If applicable:
- Proposals pending for new degree programs and status.
- Accreditation self-study and review report.
- Postdoctoral fellows (unless incorporated into narrative text in section A): Sources of support (fellowships, external grants, other) and number of fellows by year since previous review.

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

A. Graduate program and catalog copy website addresses.

B. Graduate Major Profile, by area or cluster if relevant, 6 yr. history of doctoral and/or M.F.A. students, including thesis (and/or project) title, principal advisor; year degree was awarded, and job placement.

C. Program learning outcomes curriculum matrix for each graduate program.

D. Outcomes assessment rubrics (e.g., QE or defense).

Appendix III: Undergraduate Program Profile (for each autonomous degree)

A. Undergraduate program and catalog copy website addresses.

B. Program learning outcomes curriculum matrix.

C. Outcomes assessment rubrics (e.g., capstone).

D. Student distribution among programs not consistently captured in campus data systems such as bachelor/graduate programs, concentrations, honors and intensive majors.

Appendix IV: Statistics and Student Surveys

A. Senate faculty historical roster and demographic distribution.

B. Total enrollments and student/faculty workload ratio history.

C. Senate faculty course load and enrollments history.

D. Headcount majors and degrees awarded history summary totals.

E. Headcount majors by degree program history, including declared and proposed.

F. Gender and ethnicity by major.

G. Graduate student support history.

H. Graduate student recruitment history.

I. Graduate student retention table.

J. Graduate major survey.

K. Undergraduate UCUES major survey.

Appendix V (if applicable). Professional Degree Programs (Self-Supporting or Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition).
  A. PDST or self-supporting programs most recent financial viability review.
  B. For graduate degree programs supported by Professional Degree Student Tuition (PDST), describe how the financial aid practices align with UC Regents policy on access and affordability.

APPENDIX C
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM SELF-STUDY:
ASSESSMENT, GOVERNANCE

The program faculty shall provide a narrative, not to exceed **five** (5) pages for each degree program offered, followed by appendices. The narrative shall be organized into two sections, and be supported by evidence, including the program's own learning outcomes assessment as well as student surveys and program statistics where available.

I.   Program assessment
II.   Governance, staffing, equipment and space.

The self-study should be prepared in an electronic format and appended to the administering department's self-study.

This format shall be used by an interdepartmental program reviewed concurrently with a department. Please use the format in Appendix B if an interdepartmental program is reviewed autonomously.

I.   PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Graduate Program
Describe the present and planned philosophy of the graduate degree program, including designated emphasis, collaborative, or interdisciplinary programs, addressing the following:
- Are the program faculty satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curricular offerings? Are there any unique aspects of the graduate program?
- Describe the philosophy and structure of qualifying and candidacy examinations.
- What are the student learning outcomes of the interdepartmental graduate program(s) and how are they assessed? Where are they published?
- Provide a brief description of the learning outcomes assessment process, including a multiyear assessment plan, references to assessment instruments provided in Appendix II (e.g., QE and dissertation defense rubrics), and a summary of the annual assessment findings regarding each of the program learning outcomes (as many as have been assessed to date). Comment on what the indirect evidence from the graduate student survey, such as students' self-reported competency levels and satisfaction with educational experience, indicates in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. How do measures of direct evidence of student learning agree with indirect measures?
- Overall, how has program assessment (including all steps: defining the program learning outcomes, developing the curriculum matrix or rubrics, interpreting the findings) been used to guide improvement of the program? Provide at least one example since the last review of an improvement made to some aspect of the program's curriculum or course effectiveness.
- Describe the overall quality, size, and diversity of the graduate student cohort. What is the potential student capacity of the doctoral program? Is the size of the student cohorts (masters and doctoral) 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, including possible non-academic placements.
- What are the faculty's conclusions regarding the graduate student survey?

For any offered designated emphasis or concentration, answer the following questions:
- Is the department satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curriculum for each offered designated emphasis or concentration? For each concentration, what are its unique aspects?
- Are curricular offerings sufficient to meet the demand for each offered designated emphasis or concentration? What has been the demand for each offered designated emphasis or concentration?

Undergraduate Program
Briefly describe the philosophy and structure of the undergraduate program's core Bachelor's degree programs. If there are defined concentrations within the major, explain their intended purpose and structure. For each core Bachelor's degree program, answer the following questions:
- Are the faculty satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curricular offerings? Are there any unique aspects of the undergraduate program?
- What are the student learning outcomes of the degree programs?
- Provide a brief description of the learning outcomes assessment process, including a multiyear assessment plan, references to assessment instruments provided in Appendix III (e.g., a capstone rubric), and a summary of the annual assessment findings regarding each of the program learning outcomes (as many as have been assessed to date). Comment on what the indirect evidence from the undergraduate major (UCUES) survey, such as students' self-reported competency levels and satisfaction with educational experience, indicates in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. How do measures of direct evidence of student learning agree with indirect measures?
- Overall, how has program assessment (including all steps: defining the program learning outcomes, developing the curriculum matrix or rubrics, interpreting the findings) been used to guide improvement of the program? Provide at least one example since the last review of an improvement made to some aspect of the program's curriculum or course effectiveness.
- What are the faculty's conclusions based upon the information provided in the UCUES survey?
- 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.

For any minor, major concentration, and combined major, answer the following questions:
- Is the department satisfied with the breadth, depth, and coherence of the curriculum for each minor, concentration, or combined major? For each concentration, what are its unique aspects?
- Are curricular offerings sufficient to meet the demand for each minor, concentration, or combined major? What has been the demand for each minor, concentration, or combined major?

II.   GOVERNANCE, STAFFING, EQUIPMENT AND SPACE

- Please describe the program resources, including faculty, courses, staffing, equipment, instructional technology, and space.
- Request and append comments from the overseeing dean(s) on the program's resource and administrative stability.

APPENDICES

The program faculty will provide Appendices I through III. Any applicable data that would have appeared in Appendix IV will be included in the primary departmental program data provided by the Office of Planning and Budget (for example, headcounts by degree program will be included along with the primary departmental program headcount data).

Appendix I – Program Governance
A. Current signed charter and faculty by-laws.
B. MOU's supporting any individual faculty teaching commitment.
C. Provide a link to a comprehensive faculty website address on the program home page, or a list of individual faculty links, that provides information on employment, education, current research focus, and recent published writings and creative activities for each Senate and recurring faculty member who has held an appointment in the past three years.
D. Request written comments from all department chairs and deans who are signatories to the current charter. Chairs and deans may choose not to provide a comment. Email responses are acceptable.

Appendix II - Graduate Program Profile
A. Graduate program and catalog copy website addresses.
B. Graduate Major Profile, by area or cluster if relevant, 6 yr. history of Ph.D. students, including thesis title, principal advisor, year degree awarded, and job placement.
C. Program learning outcomes curriculum matrix for each graduate program.
D. Outcomes assessment rubrics (e.g., QE or defense).

Appendix III: Undergraduate Program Profile (for each autonomous degree)
A. Undergraduate program and catalog copy website addresses.
B. Program learning outcomes curriculum matrix.
C. Outcomes assessment rubrics (e.g., capstone).

Appendix IV (if applicable). Professional Degree Programs (Self-Supporting or Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition).
A. PDST or self-supporting programs most recent financial viability review.
B. For graduate degree programs supported by Professional Degree Student Tuition (PDST), describe how the financial aid practices align with UC Regents policy on access and affordability.

APPENDIX D
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	Length	Required Participants	Notes
Entrance Interview	30 min	Dean, VPAA	
In no particular order	5 hrs	Ladder faculty	Individuals or groups as appropriate
	30 min	Faculty Graduate Committee	If applicable
	30 min	Chairs of departments served	If applicable
	30 min	Faculty Undergraduate Committee	
	30 min	Chairs of departments served	If applicable
	30 min	Senior staff representative, instructional support staff, and/or research staff	
	45 min	Graduate Students	
	30 min	Undergraduate Students	If applicable
	45 min	Postdoctoral fellows	If applicable
	60 min 60 min	Day 1 – ERC Closed Session Day 2 – ERC Closed Session	Immediately prior to exit interviews
Exit interviews	60 min	Dean	
	60 min	CP/EVC, VPAA	

TOTAL Hours   **14**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The time required is contingent on the size and complexity of the department. Two days is typical, but the dean may schedule more or less than two days as necessary.
- Time should be scheduled for the ERC 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 ERC members should not be separated, if at all possible.
- A brief walking tour of key physical facilities may be appropriate.

Eight-Year Cycle	Date	Responsible	Recipient	Copied
Year 1 – Prior to Review Visit				
F – Notify department, solicit nominations for ERC		Dean	Department	VPAA, P&B[5]
FWS – Prepare departmental self-study		Department		
FW – VPAA meets with dept re: process		VPAA	Department	
FW – Provide centrally-produced data for appendices		P&B	Department	VPAA, Dean
S – Submit self-study and reviewer nominations	May 1	Department	Dean	
S – Request approval of reviewer nominations		Dean	VPAA	Dept, P&B
S – Approve reviewer nominations		VPAA	Dean	Dept, P&B
Year 2 – The Review/Site Visit				
F – Self-study, charge, and supplemental dean's comments[6]	Sept 1	Dean	VPAA	All parties[7]
F – Supplemental comments	Nov 15	VPAA, VPDUE, VPDGS, Senate	Dean	All parties
FW – Distribute self-study and comments to ERC	1 mo prior	Dean	Reviewers	
WS – ERC site visit		Dean		
S – External Review Report submitted	4 weeks	ERC	Dean	
S – External Review Report distributed	Immediately	Dean	Department	All parties
S – Departmental response	4 weeks	Department	Dean	
S/Su – Dean's response (including Dept response)	2 weeks	Dean	VPAA	All parties
Year 3 – Closure				
F – Senate responses, re-approval of minors, concentrations, combined majors	6 weeks	CEP, GC, CPB	VPAA	All parties
FW – Closure meeting		VPAA		All parties
WS – Closure Report/mid-cycle update questions	4 weeks	VPAA	CP/EVC	All parties
Year 4				
Year 5 – Mid-Cycle Update – deadline published in the Closure Report				
Prepare and submit mid-cycle report		Department	Dean	
Distribution of mid-cycle report, with optional comments		Dean	VPAA	Department
Mid-cycle review meeting, if necessary		VPAA		All parties
Recommend and set review cycle (6, 7, 8 years, or accelerated)		VPAA	Senate	Dean, Department

---

[5] Academic Planning and Resources Assistant Director in Planning & Budget.

[6] The self-study distribution to campus should be e-mailed to abrondar@ucsc.edu in Planning & Budget to be posted for administration and Senate review.

[7] All Parties copied include campus units directly involved in external reviews (VPAA, VPDUE, VPDGS, Dean, Dept Chair, Senate Office, P&B).