Notification – sent in March

- Letter/memo sent from Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review (UIPR) Committee to program chairs and Budget & Institutional Analysis (BIA) alerting them of upcoming review. Include:
  ✓ Overview of program review
  ✓ List of programs in cluster
  ✓ Explanation and request for nominations for external reviewers (one campus-wide and one nation-wide).
  ✓ Request for program/department contact

Kickoff Meeting - April

- Kickoff meeting is held outlining process and responsibilities associated with preparation of the Self-Review and Review Team visit.
- Programs may discuss additional data needs with the UIPR Chair and BIA representative. All must agree the additional data is valuable and will positively impact the review process.
- Kickoff meeting includes: UIPR chair, Academic Senate (AS) analyst, AS administrative assistant, General Education Committee (GEC) chair, BIA team, program chairs, others from program involved in the review process. Only in exceptional circumstances should substitute representatives attend.

Review Team (RT) Selection - May

- Nominations for members of the RT will be requested from the program faculty, and the associated FEC(s) and Dean(s). Each group will be asked to compile one list of five individuals from outside the UCD campus and one list of five individuals from within the UCD campus (4 lists/program) identifying any possible conflicts of interest. Nominations are sent to AS office by May 15.
- UIPR selects the Review Team (RT) to be comprised of one campus-wide and one nation-wide reviewer from the nominations received from programs and colleges. The campus-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate campus issues. The campus-wide reviewer should be familiar with the discipline but should not be a member of the program faculty or administration. The nation-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate the program from a national perspective.
- The standard will be to have one off-campus reviewer and one campus reviewer for each program; however if UIPR feels it necessary, they propose addition of a reviewer to UGC and the Academic Senate Chair. UGC will be authorized to approve the additional review; the Academic Senate Chair will approve expenditure of additional funding.
- Based on ranking of nominees performed by UIPR, invitations will be sent, solidifying the Review Team membership by September 1.

Review Team Visit Planning - June-August

- The Academic Senate Office will coordinate RT two-day visits allowing two days for meeting and interviewing program members.
The Academic Senate Office will coordinate with a pre-identified program staff member to schedule interviews with program faculty, students, program chair and supporting committees, focusing on scheduling the RT visit at a time that allows maximum opportunity for faculty and student to participate.

Data Disbursement – September

- BIA sends data (see attached data set list) to departments with copy to AS UIPR analyst.
- UIPR analyst will archive all data and reports as received on the UIPR whiteboard.
- UIPR analyst sends most recent review to program contact

Self-Review Completed – September-December

- The program is given a quarter to complete the self-review.
- Completed self-reviews are sent to UIPR analyst by a specified date in early January.

Review Team Visit – Winter/Spring Quarter (varies by program)

- UIPR analyst forwards program self-review to the RT along with confirmation of visit details
- RT meets with faculty, staff, students, executive committee, deans and others as appropriate over a two-day period. Note: The RT must meet with groups together to assure RT members receive all of the information directly. The UIPR member assigned to oversee the review will be invited to attend the meetings if desired.
- Completed RT reports are sent to UIPR analyst within two weeks of the RT visit. The campus-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate campus issues and the nation-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate the program from a national perspective. The reviewers are free to determine if they wish to submit individual or separate reports so long as both perspectives are addressed.
- UIPR analyst assures all review information is available within one week of receipt.
- UIPR analyst forwards RT report to program for correction of fact allowing not more than 1 week for response.

UIPR Assesses Reviews – Will occur as reports are received.

- UIPR members are assigned majors/programs to review and write draft assessment summaries
- Draft summaries are sent to the UIPR analyst as completed and posted on ASIS for committee review prior to meeting
- Draft summaries are discussed by UIPR members during a meeting
- It should be only in rare circumstances that necessitates additional information requests from the program. If additional information is requested by UIPR committee, responsible member goes back to program to obtain requested information and revised report is presented again to UIPR. This continues until report is approved by committee
• UIPR generates a report to identify status of any outstanding follow-up issues from previous reviews, program specific strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for corrective action. UIPR’s report will include (as attachments) the program self-review and RT report.
• UIPR will forward reports as completed to Undergraduate Council (UGC).

UGC Review of UIPR Report – typically spring quarter

• UGC will include the UIPR program report on the next available agenda.
• UGC will review the report during a Council meeting. If UGC has questions or concerns the report is returned to UIPR for refinement and resubmission to UGC. In this process UGC should not request that UIPR recommendations should be changed. It is be UGC prerogative to make recommendations different than UIPR.
• Following review and endorsement of the UIPR report, UGC will forward a letter to the Provost communicating observations, recommendations, etc. with copy to AS Chair, Deans, Program Chairs, FEC, AS Exec. Dir., VPUE, & UIPR analyst. The Provost has agreed to coordinate all response to administrative corrective action (budgetary allocation, FTE, space, safety, etc.) with the Dean and program. UGC will communicate directly with the program concerning academic corrective actions such as issues with curricula/academic matters.
• IF necessary, UGC may ask UIPR to conduct an interim review when matters are of grave concern. If an interim review is desired, the time frame for the review and matters to be re-examined will be outlined in the UGC summary described above. The interim review will be focused on specific serious issues requiring correction within 1-3 years from UGC report. This review must remain focused on the issues identified and should not serve to uncover additional issues in need of attention. In the event that additional issues arise, UGC will be notified to decide on subsequent action.

Closing Each Cluster – Fall & Winter Quarter of Year Following Review

• Provost sets meetings with Deans and Program chairs to discuss UGC recommendations. (1 mtg for all programs in each college = 3 mtgs)
• Provost sets follow-up meetings with Deans and program chairs to determine if concerns have been addressed
• Provost's office will notify UGC, Dean's office and Program of action. UGC will maintain a record of recommendations made assuring a complete record of activity for archive and use by the program during the next review.
• Once all reviews from the Cluster are complete, a "Cluster Summary" letter is sent to Provost. UIPR will provide UGC a report concerning trends within the cluster following completion of all program reviews.
• UGC will review and approve the report forwarding it to the Provost, Deans and all Programs.
• The UIPR analyst will maintain a complete file (all correspondence and reports, action assigned and taken) associated with the programs and cluster reviewed.
Data Provided to Programs from the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis

- Appendix A, provided by the Office of the Registrar, includes catalog descriptions of all programs in the cluster
- Appendix B contains information on instruction, students, and faculty gathered by Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) using data from a variety of sources
- Appendix C includes the results of two surveys conducted by BIA: the first gathered the opinions of students in selected classes one and four years after graduation, and the second is a subset of data taken from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which focuses on current upper division students
- Appendix D, provided by the Office of the Registrar, is a list of the educational objectives of the campus, as published in the General Catalog.

The data presented in Appendices A-C provides the basis to make comparisons between programs being reviewed in the same cluster as well as division, college, and the entire campus. Generally, the BIA data on students and faculty were compiled for the home department of the program, while the survey data (the undergraduate experience survey and the alumni survey) were compiled by the students’ majors. If, in consultation with departments, it is determined that this approach would not provide useful information for the major, alternative information is provided based on the core courses that the department has identified for the major.