Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review and GE Assessment Orientation
2023-24
Cluster 2 Review Cycle
Introductions
# Cluster 2 Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs (majors and minors) - Reviewed by UIPRC</th>
<th>Subject Codes with GE Literacies - Reviewed by GEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>Atmospheric Science, Environmental Toxicology, Hydrology</td>
<td>ATM, ETX, HYD, SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Cell Biology, Genetics and Genomics, Systems and Synthetic Biology (no review in 23-24)</td>
<td>MCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Chemistry (all four Chemistry programs reviewed together) --- Applied Chemistry --- Chemical Physics --- Chemistry --- Pharmaceutical Chemistry Computer Science Data Science (no review in 2023-24) Geology Mathematics (all four Mathematics programs reviewed together) --- Applied Mathematics --- Mathematics --- Mathematical and Scientific Computation --- Mathematical Analytics and Operations Research Physics (both Physics majors reviewed together) --- Applied Physics --- Physics Statistics</td>
<td>CHE, GEL, MAT, PHY, STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>CHA, HPH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why are Program Review and GE Assessment Important?

- Responsibility for oversight of curriculum and education policy was granted to the Senate by the Regents—the very core of Shared Governance
- A time for faculty to reflect and discuss instructional quality, learning outcomes, equity, access, and inclusion
- An opportunity for programs to update and assess the coherence of their curriculum, including future development of the major and minor
- Crucial pillar of maintaining WASC accreditation
- A discussion where reviewers invite and listen to every faculty voice
- Your chance to communicate what resources your program needs to achieve or maintain excellence
Program Review and Campus Budget Process:

Conversations about program reviews don’t stop after the program review closure process—they have some teeth!

1. The campus Administration responds in writing to the recommendations in the program review reports and related Senate committee recommendations

2. Colleges/schools use information from recent program reviews when filling out annual campus budget questionnaires

3. These budget questionnaire responses are reviewed by the Faculty Executive Committees, the Committee on Planning and Budget, and campus Administration
General Education Assessment
General Education Assessment

• Current UC Davis General Education (GE) requirements became effective during the Fall Quarter 2011 with minimum elements for the certification of general education courses. This process has been adopted as a result of past WASC review recommendations.

• Current GE requirements, literacy interpretations, and minimum elements can be found at: https://ge.ucdavis.edu/faculty-staff-resources

• The GE Assessment consists of:
  I. GE Committees in-depth assessment of specific courses
  II. Program self-assessment of all courses with GE literacies
I. GE Committee Assessment of Specific Courses

• The GE Committee specifies courses for GE Committee assessment. Programs can access the list of courses via the GE Committee website, within their *Instructions* document.

  https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committees/undergraduate-council/general-education

• Departments are asked to collect assessment materials in Spring Quarter, Summer Sessions, and/or Fall Quarter 2023, depending on which term the specific courses will be offered.

• Programs must review their specific course lists before the beginning of Spring Quarter, to ensure that all the specific courses will be offered in Spring, Summer, or Fall of 2023 and reach out to Theresa with any questions.
I. GE Committee Assessment of Specific Courses

The Committee requests assessment materials from the specific course. Requested data includes:

- A statement (maximum of one page) explaining how course meets the minimum elements of the literacy
- Representative assignments which reflect each of the approved literacies
- Three pieces of graded student work (with names redacted) from that assignment. The student work samples should consist of one average, one below average, and one above average.
- The course syllabus

GE Committee assessment of the specific courses will consider whether the submitted materials demonstrate that the course under review satisfies each of the minimum elements for each literacy.
II. Program Self-Assessment of All GE Literacy Courses

• The GE Committee asks programs to self-assess all courses with GE literacies to ensure that the courses continue to satisfy the minimum elements for those literacies.

• An assessment table will be provided to the programs via the GE Committee webpage, titled Program self-assessment spreadsheet
  https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committees/undergraduate-council/general-education
II. Program Self-Assessment of All GE Literacy Courses

GE has eight literacy categories:

- Writing Experience (WE)
- Oral Skills Literacy (OL)
- American Cultures, Governance & History (ACGH)
- World Cultures (WC)
- Quantitative Literacy (QL)
- Scientific Literacy (SL)
- Domestic Diversity (DD)
- Visual Literacy (VL)

Descriptions of these literacies can be found at: [https://ge.ucdavis.edu/faculty-staff-resources](https://ge.ucdavis.edu/faculty-staff-resources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Writing Literacy</th>
<th>Oral Literacy</th>
<th>Visual Literacy</th>
<th>American Cultures, Governance &amp; History</th>
<th>World Cultures</th>
<th>Quantitative Literacy</th>
<th>Scientific Literacy</th>
<th>Domestic Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>046C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Program Self-Assessment of All GE Literacy Courses

• The program chair should assign self-review of each course to the instructor of that course. If there are multiple instructors for a course, one instructor should coordinate the response for that course. The name and email address of the instructor should be reported on the table.

• The assessment table asks faculty to determine whether the course meets the minimum elements for the currently approved literacy(ies).
  • If not:
    • Will the course be revised to meet minimum elements for the currently approved literacy(ies), or
    • Will be course form be modified and resubmitted in ICMS to remove GE literacy designations?
General Education Assessment - Next Steps

What does the GE Committee do after receiving the materials?

• The GE committee will review all submitted materials and write a letter to each program noting observations, suggesting improvements, and indicating their assessment of each specific course. The letters are reviewed by UGC, then sent to the programs and the Provost.

• The GE committee will also write an overall summary of GE assessment for those programs in the cluster to the Provost.
General Education Assessment - Next Steps

What does the program do after receiving the letter from the GE Committee?

• If the GE Committee and the self-assessment found that all reviewed courses meet the minimum elements of the approved literacies, no follow up is necessary.
General Education Assessment - Next Steps

What does the program do after receiving the letter from the GE Committee?

- If the GE Committee or the self-assessment found that one or more of the reviewed courses does not demonstrate the minimum elements of the approved literacies, the committee will request a letter of response.

- If a letter of response is not received, or if the letter of response does not adequately address GECs concerns, the documents are forwarded to the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) for further action.

- COCI has a streamlined process to remove the literacy designation if the GE Committee or program finds that a course does not meet the minimum elements for the literacy:
  
About

The General Education Subcommittee supervises the General Education (GE) program by establishing criteria that govern certification of courses for the GE program; periodically reviewing courses that are approved for GE credit; actively promoting the development of new GE courses; and continually reviewing the effectiveness of the GE program.

Resources

Overview

- UC Davis General Education Requirements
- Cluster 7 Orientation Meeting PowerPoint Presentation
- General Education Assessment Workflow
- General Education Assessment Schedule

GE Committee Website: https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committees/undergraduate-council/general-education
General Education Faculty and Staff Resources

Breadth and Literacy Information
The documents below provide information about GE requirements, the interpretations of those requirements, the minimum elements expected of courses approved in each literacy, and guidance on how the Committee on Courses of Instruction reviews requests for GE literacies through course request forms in the Integrated Curriculum Management System.

› Topical Breadth
› Literacies:
  › Writing Experience
  › Oral Skills
  › Visual
  › American Cultures, Governance, and History
  › Domestic Diversity
  › World Cultures
  › Quantitative
  › Scientific

General Education Literacy/Minimum Elements Website: https://ge.ucdavis.edu/faculty-staff-resources
General Education Committee Contact Information

• GE Committee Chair:
  • Marina Ellefson Crowder
  • mecrowder@ucdavis.edu

• GE Committee Analyst:
  • Theresa Costa
  • tacosta@ucdavis.edu
Undergraduate Program Review
Review Team (RT) Process

Stages of the Review Team Process
Review Team (RT) Selection

Recruit two faculty members who will be able to rapidly grasp the workings of your undergraduate instructional program and the campus context

- expertise appropriate for assessing the program being reviewed
- experience in program or campus leadership is a plus
- experience related to undergraduate education is a plus

External Reviewer Nominees
- Faculty from any college or university outside of UC Davis

UC Davis Reviewer Nominees
- Academic Senate members on the UC Davis campus
Review Team (RT) Selection

- Nominations for RT members requested from program faculty
- Program contacts submit nominations via survey by April 21, 2023
- RT nominations sent to FEC and Deans for input
- UIPR reviews nominations and sends out invitations based on rankings
- RT members are confirmed (2 members)
Review Team (RT): Conflicts of Interest

Potential review team members will be asked to disclose any potential conflicts of interest. Including...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Reviewer Nominees</th>
<th>UC Davis Reviewer Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• active collaboration in teaching or research</td>
<td>• current or previous members of the undergraduate program under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• co-authored of any research publications within the past five years</td>
<td>• current or previous instructors in the program under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• currently listed as a co-PI on a proposed grant or contract</td>
<td>• collaborations in research, grants, or contracts with any program faculty in the past five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• co-instructor on a proposed course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• departmental colleague with, student of, or supervisor for any program faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Team (RT): Resolving Potential Conflicts of Interest

- Be transparent about RT member(s) potential conflicts of interest
  - Nominees may still be submitted along with an explanation of the potential conflict.

- The UIPR Committee will review the information and determine if a meaningful conflict of interest exists
  - If the disclosed conflict appears likely to create appreciable bias, UIPR will recruit an alternative reviewer.

- An ongoing process – update UIPR if any potential conflicts of interest emerge
Self-Review Process
UIPR Self-Review Template

• **Section 1** – Overview of the major/program
• **Section 2** – Outcome of the last review
• **Section 3-8** – Major/program information
  • 3 – faculty in the major
  • 4 – instruction in the major, staff, space, and facilities
  • 5 – students in the major
  • 6 – students’ perceptions of the major
  • 7 – post-graduate preparation
  • 8 – assessment
• **Section 9** – Major strengths and weaknesses
• **Section 10** – Future plans
• **Section 11** – Minors (list on next slide)
• **Section 12** – Emergency Remote Instruction
### UIPR Self-Review Template

Minors to be included in section 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Administering Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Geology</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Toxicology</td>
<td>Environmental Toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>Land, Air &amp; Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Land, Air &amp; Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Science Studies</td>
<td>Land, Air &amp; Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td>Land, Air &amp; Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Science</td>
<td>Land, Air &amp; Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Provided to Programs via Tableau

• Program data is provided by Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) via Tableau.

• Data includes instructors and students, survey data from current students and recent graduates, and general information from the course catalog.

• Data is presented to allow for comparisons to other programs in the same cluster as well as comparisons to the college and campus.

• BIA will work with the departments and IET to make sure that all members of the review teams can access the online data.

• BIA will work directly with some programs to ensure we have the correct instructors and courses.
## Sample Appendix B – Instructor and Student Data

**UC DAVIS**

**Undergraduate Program Review**

### CATEGORY - FACULTY IN MAJOR

**Ladder Faculty - Instructional FTE by Rank, Change in the Past Seven Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC DAVIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>176.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>100.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Plant Pathology</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>-48.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Program Global Disease Biology</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>-36.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental Science and Policy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>123.2%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Human Ecology</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land, Air, and Water Resources</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Program Environmental Sci and Mgmt</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Nutrition</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional FTE</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Appendix C – Survey Data

College of Agriculture & Environmental Sciences - Cluster 5
Category: Resources in the Major
Sub-Category: Resources in the Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart #</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Satisfied or Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>UCUES</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with: Availability of library research resources? (Repeat of Fig 10)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>Clinical Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Environmental Policy, Analysis &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Environmental Science &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Global Disease Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College: 63%
Campus: 63%
Assessment Support from the Office of Undergraduate Education
Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Support for Program Review

Erica Bender, Ph.D.
Assessment Specialist

Kara Moloney, Ph.D.
Assessment Team Lead
We are academic assessment professionals, teachers, lifelong learners, and student advocates.

We study and promote strong practices in academic assessment and think deeply about assessment as a tool for equity and inclusion.

We partner with faculty to implement assessment in ways that make sense for their course, program, and discipline.

We support assessment so that faculty can focus on what they do best: engaging students in transformational learning experiences.
What We Offer

Workshops and other resources on assessment-related topics
Consultations and conversations one-on-one or with your committee
Facilitated discussions / group brainstorming sessions
Short- and long-term assessment planning and assessment inquiry designs
Administrative support with data synthesis, data disaggregation, data analysis
PACE4Equity: 12-month, project-based program assessment for teams/committees
How We Think About Assessment

Assessment is a process that happens one step at a time.

Assessment is not about evaluation; assessment starts from an assumption that the program is worthwhile.

Assessment uncovers opportunities for future direction so that the program can keep evolving and improving, as well as enabling program advocacy.

Assessment is way to observe what expert teachers value: students’ deep learning and their abilities to use what they’ve learned.

Assessment is fascinating!
In a Nutshell: Program-Level Assessment

Articulate & communicate expectations → Analyze curriculum → Design inquiry → Collect evidence → Analyze & interrogate results → Act

No need to assess everything all at once!
The process is cyclical, meant to be repeated and refined with each iteration.
More information about each stage is available on our website:
assessment.ucdavis.edu
Recommended Next Steps

1. Connect with the Assessment Team for support.
2. Start by identifying the outcome(s) you want to assess and where the outcome is developed in your required courses.
3. Look to particular courses to identify evidence (assignments/tasks where students demonstrate the outcome).
4. Aim to collect evidence (student work and/or scores) from 2-3 of those courses in the Spring (or early-Fall).
5. Ideal: analyze data over Summer (or mid-Fall), to incorporate findings and future actions into your self-review report.
Assessment Support Resources for Program Review

Workshop: Getting Started with Program-Level Assessment

- April 11, 10:00-11:30 a.m., via Zoom
- Registration Link

Guides (in chat and shared with UIPRC)

- The Assessment Process
- Sample Program Assessment Plan
- Definitions/Glossary

Follow Up Support

- Consultations, planning, support for each step
In Closing…

We echo the sentiment that program review is an opportunity to (re-)connect with things we all care about:

- Instructional quality
- Learning outcomes
- Equity, access, and inclusion
- Future opportunities for programs

There are many ways to enact high-quality program assessment, we’re here to help you discover and unlock the possibilities.
Thanks!

Connect with us!
assessment@ucdavis.edu
Review Visit and Post Visit Process

In Summer, Senate Office schedules Review Team visits for Winter Quarter

In Fall, a program-designated faculty member builds the itinerary for Winter visit.

Senate forwards program self-review and past-review to Review Team before Winter visit

Review Team conducts Winter Quarter visit (January-March)

Review Team reports sent to UIPRC analyst within two weeks of visit

RT reports are sent to programs for correction of fact

UIPRC members serve as Review Team hosts and write report for UGC

Reports are discussed and approved by UIPRC

UIPRC forwards reports to UGC with Self-Review, Review Team report, and BIA data

UGC reviews reports and writes letter of recommendations to Program Chair, Dean, and Provost in June/July

Office of Undergrad Education coordinates Fall meetings to discuss recommendations and determine actions

UGC receives response letter from AVPAP in winter and writes a final closure response
Program Review and the Office of Undergraduate Education

- Matt Traxler, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning
- Will meet with Program Chairs and Deans in Fall 2024 to discuss program review reports and draft the response to UGC; an opportunity for Program Chairs to have a focused conversation with their deans about undergraduate instruction
- Contributions of program review to accreditation
Closing Each Cluster

• UIPR will provide UGC a report, the Cluster 2 Summary Report, regarding trends within the cluster following completion of all program reviews.

• UGC will review and approve the report and send to the Provost.

• Additional information about the closure process can be found on the Undergraduate Council website
About

The Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review (UIPR) Subcommittee studies the effectiveness and efficiency of undergraduate programs at UC Davis and makes recommendations for improvements. UIPR determines if established educational objectives for programs have been meaningfully addressed.

Resources

Cluster 7 Orientation Meeting PowerPoint Presentation

Program Review Process

UIPRC Website: https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committees/undergraduate-council/uipr
Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Committee (UIPRC) Contact Information

- UIPR Committee Chair:
  - Mitch Singer
  - mhsinger@ucdavis.edu

- UIPR Committee Analyst:
  - Theresa Costa
  - tacosta@ucdavis.edu
**Important Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2023</td>
<td>Programs notified of pending review via invitation to Orientation Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 2023</td>
<td>Orientation Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2023</td>
<td>Deadline for Review Team nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2023</td>
<td>Programs begin collecting student work, GE course assessment, and the Program Self-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program faculty and staff embark on discussions of strengths and weaknesses in their curriculum, and contact Kara Moloney (<a href="mailto:kmoloney@ucdavis.edu">kmoloney@ucdavis.edu</a>) in Undergraduate Education for resources and support in the self-review process and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2023</td>
<td>BIA publishes data appendices to on-line portal Tableau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Quarter 2023</td>
<td>Programs finish collecting student work, GE course assessment, and the Program Self-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 2024</td>
<td>Deadline for completed Self-Reviews and GE assessment materials to be submitted to the Academic Senate Office (<a href="mailto:tacosta@ucdavis.edu">tacosta@ucdavis.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2024</td>
<td>Review teams meet with programs and submit reports to UIPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2024</td>
<td>UIPR analyzes and forwards all reports to Undergraduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Quarter 2024</td>
<td>UGC reviews all reports and forwards recommendations to Provost, Deans, Department Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2025</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning convenes meetings with Deans and Program Chairs to discuss UGC recommendations and determine actions to be taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UGC receives responses from Deans, Provost, Program Chairs and closes the reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>