

## **AN INTERIM GUIDE FOR THE REVIEW OF EXISTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS/UNITS**

This guide is prepared as an interim replacement for the current Academic Program Review guidelines, published at

<http://opa.vcbf.berkeley.edu/AcademicPrograms/Review.Index.htm>

These guidelines are to remain in effect until such time as the current Program review Working Group finishes its recommendations and the Academic Senate finalizes them. The authority for these interim guidelines rests with the Principles for Program Reviews strategic plan passed by the 2001-2002 Academic Senate under Chair David Dowall, as well as written authority from Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Paul Gray.

### **Review of Existing Instructional Programs/Units**

#### Step 1: Selection of programs/units for review

Programs/units targeted for review are determined annually, in the spring, by consensus of the Program review Oversight Committee (PROC). This committee consists of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Graduate Dean, Associate Graduate Dean (for Reviews), and the Chairs of the Graduate Council, Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, and Committee on Educational Policy. Divisional Council will make its suggestions known through its committees. The Associate Graduate Dean, in turn, notifies the chairs of the units selected and their cognizant deans. The unit chairs are asked to provide the Associate Graduate Dean (for Reviews) a list of suggested external reviewers, a list of no fewer than two comparison departments on the Berkeley campus, and a list of no fewer than two comparison departments at other institutions.

#### Step 2: PROC formulation of review charge

As part of its discussions of the selection of departments for review, the PROC will identify some especially salient issues from the list included as "Review Issues to the Committee" in the Appendix. These issues will be communicated to the department and will be identified in the charge to the Review Committee.

#### Step 3: Self-review

Selected unit conducts a self-review, focusing on established guidelines (see Appendix II, "Outline for Departmental Self-Review Reports"), the high-priority issues highlighted by the PROC, and any other special issues identified when the review is requested. The deadline for the self-review is dictated by the schedule for the arrival of an external visiting committee

#### Step 4: Review Committee

The Associate Graduate Dean in consultation with the cognizant unit dean, the unit chair, and the PROC, assembles a Review Committee. Appendix III shows a sample charge letter to the committee. In general, the committee is directed to examine the unit's self-review and respond to the specific issues identified by the members of the PROC as

noted above.

The Review Committee meets with the unit's students, faculty, and senior staff, as well as campus administrators. A member of the Berkeley Academic Senate will serve on the Review Committee during their interviews; this faculty member is appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees and reports to the Graduate Council and CEP. The Review Committee has a brief interview with the PROC and the cognizant dean. Prior to their departure the external members of the Committee prepare a draft report summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the unit and addressing the issues raised in its charge. The Berkeley Academic Senate member does not contribute to the external members' draft report, but reports in person and/or in writing to the GC and CEP. The report of the External Committee members is delivered to the Graduate Associate Dean (for Reviews) upon their departure from campus. The unit chair (or dean in the case of a school) reviews this report for factual accuracy and is given two weeks to respond.

The final report with factual corrections is then distributed to the unit for faculty and graduate and undergraduate student review and response; these responses, including a summary letter from the unit's head, are due back to the Graduate Dean in six weeks.

#### Step 5: Report Distribution and Responses from Senate Committees

The final report and the responses from the unit under review are then distributed to the Academic Senate, as well as administration members of the PROC. Subsequently the cognizant dean and the appropriate college/school executive committee (if applicable) independently discuss the review committee report and the responses to the report from the unit. The cognizant dean and the executive committee (If applicable) each then prepares a position paper. These papers are sent directly to the Associate Dean (Program Reviews).

At their discretion, the Graduate Council, Committee on Educational Policy or the Budget and Interdepartmental Relations Committee may elect to convene a discussion meeting based on the Review Committee's report, the reports by the Academic Senate member of the Review Committee, and the responses from the relevant unit or department. This meeting shall take place within 10 weeks of the submission by the relevant unit or department of its responses to the Review Committee report. The attendees and purpose of the meeting are determined by the relevant Academic Senate Chairs, and the Academic Senate Committees are responsible for convening the meeting. At the conclusion of the discussion meeting, reports summarizing their views are submitted by the three Divisional Committees to the Divisional Council (DIVCO), which forwards copies, along with DIVCO's comments, to the Associate Dean (Program reviews) in preparation for the wrap-up meeting. If the Senate Committees elect not to hold a discussion meeting, their reports will be submitted to the Associate Dean (Program Reviews) within 10 weeks of submission by the relevant unit or department of its responses to the Review Committee report.

#### Step 6: Wrap-up meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to make final recommendations for the unit. Attendees at this meeting are the PROC, the cognizant dean of the unit, and the Graduate Division Academic Affairs Coordinator. The outcome of this meeting is reported via a summary letter composed by the AA Coordinator and reviewed by the PROC and cognizant dean. The letter is then sent to the chair of the unit being reviewed. Copies are sent to the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors, Academic Senate Chair, the Executive Director for Planning and Analysis, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and the Dean of the Graduate Division.

#### Step 6: The Unit Response

The summary letter will specify the expected unit response as well as a timetable for the response(s). The unit should anticipate that responses to the letter should at least be included in their next budget and/or FTE request.

#### **APPENDIX I. AUTHORITY FOR CONDUCTING REVIEWS**

The Academic Senate derives its authority for the review of academic programs from The Regents' Standing Orders and Bylaws of the Berkeley Division. These are detailed at the website

<http://opa.vcbf.berkeley.edu/AcademicPrograms/Review.Index.htm>

## APPENDIX II.

### SUGGESTED INTERIM OUTLINE FOR SELF-REVIEW TO BE SUBMITTED BY ACADEMIC UNITS SELECTED FOR REVIEW

#### I. OVERVIEW

- A. Brief description of the goals and mission of the graduate and undergraduate programs; description of areas of excellence.
- B. The five-year academic plan for the unit, **including faculty recruiting and plans for maintaining and enhancing diversity of faculty and students.**

#### II. PROGRAM(S)

- A. A description of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs, specialty areas in which degrees may be earned, and the rationale for degree requirements. Provide information about the unique elements of the program.
  - 1. What are the objectives, how are they measured, and how well are they being met?
  - 2. How do the programs compare with similar programs at comparable institutions?
  - 3. How many students do the programs serve? (majors, minors, outside students?)
  - 4. Are the programs growing in terms of students or faculty FTE?
  - 5. Is the size of the faculty and support staff adequate to the number of students in the undergraduate program? The graduate program?
  - 6. What are the admission procedures for the undergraduate major, and what is the student demand?
  - 7. What are the admission procedures for the graduate program, and what is the yield rate (both with and without financial aid)?
- B. The undergraduate program:
  - 1. What constitutes “quality” in undergraduate education in your field? How does your unit measure and meet this standard of quality?
  - 2. What contributions does the program make to general education and to the American Cultures requirement, including service courses and other courses for non-majors? Please list number and size of service courses, freshman and sophomore seminars, American Culture courses—and indicate the percentage of faculty who offer such courses.

3. What opportunities are provided for undergraduate participation in research? Please list courses, internships, paid positions, etc and indicate the number of students.
  4. What opportunities does your unit support in terms of curriculum enrichment—namely international studies and academic service learning?
  5. What opportunities are available for honors theses, and for capstone experiences? What percentages of majors take advantage of these opportunities?
  6. How does the program deal with the special needs of community college and other transfer students?
  7. What is the average time to degree (for both native and transfer students), and what actions are being taken to ensure that students graduate in a timely manner?
  8. What information does the unit use, from the Career Center or elsewhere, about the subsequent job placement or graduate training of its Bachelor degree graduates? What are the trends in that information?
  - 9.
- C. The graduate program:
1. What constitutes “quality” in graduate education in your field? How does your unit measure and meet this standard of quality?
  2. What other institutions compete with you for graduate students? What constitutes “success” for you in this competition? What limits your ability to “succeed” further?
  3. What are the policies and procedures for the examinations necessary to obtain Masters and Doctoral degrees.
  4. Describe how graduate students are mentored.
  5. Show the job placement of your graduate students during last 5 years.
- D. Links with other units on campus, such as joint faculty appointments and shared courses. Number of undergraduate and graduate service courses and enrollments.

### III. THE FACULTY

- A. Abbreviated curriculum vitae for all faculty members, including lecturers.
- B. Quality of Instruction:
  1. What are the methods used by the unit to evaluate the quality of teaching? How is the information gathered by these methods used for feedback to the instructor, and for planning and decision-making?
  2. What are the incentives and rewards for faculty contributions to both the undergraduate and graduate teaching enterprise?

3. What teaching resources does the unit use to enhance the quality of instruction?
  4. What efforts are being made to survey recent degree recipients (e.g. exit surveys) and alumni about the quality of the program, and what has been learned from these?
  5. Describe possible innovations in teaching that are contemplated.
- C. Faculty teaching loads. (See Section VII.B.5.).
1. Description of internal policy for making teaching assignments, i.e., information on average teaching load per faculty member in the unit
  2. Percentage of courses taught by: a) ladder-rank faculty, b) lecturers and c) GSI's in lower division; upper division. Please explain the rationale for the pattern of allocation.
  3. Student contact hours according to academic title.
- D. Faculty Advising and Mentoring
1. What is the distribution of mentoring and advising responsibilities to faculty and staff, and what methods are used to evaluate their effectiveness
  2. What are the procedures for faculty oversight of undergraduate special studies courses (e.g., field studies, group studies including DE-Cal courses, independent research)?
  3. Average length of service as graduate, major, and other advisers.
  4. Faculty participation in the mentoring of GSIs and their preparation for teaching. What are procedures for their oversight?
  5. Description of the unit's system of advising and guiding students and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the system.
- E. Recruitment success. Job offers made and accepted in the last five years.

#### IV. UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

- A. Procedures for admission to the undergraduate major program(s); undergraduate student demand for the major, and in the professional schools, acceptance rate.
- B. Procedures for admission to the graduate program(s), proportion offered financial aid, and proportion accepting without financial aid.
- C. Amount of graduate student support and procedures for distributing it.
- D. Teaching opportunities for graduate students and how they are distributed. Preparation for teaching.
- E. Description of outreach plan to promote diversity in the graduate program. Role of affirmative action adviser.

## V. PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND OTHER RESOURCES

- A. A general comment on the physical facilities and how they may affect the teaching or research programs. Comment on the resources available for the unit to achieve its mission.

## VI. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

- A. Feasibility of faculty members engaging in informed collective discussion on all-important unit issues.
- B. Role of chair, vice-chair, and executive committee (if applicable). Provide names of other unit committees.
- C. Participation of non-tenured faculty in decisions and administration. Mentoring of faculty.
- D. Student participation in decisions and administration.

## VII. STATISTICAL DATA

The campus offices designated below will provide the information listed below. This information will be collected by the Graduate Division and forwarded to unit chairs. **Unit chairs must include this information with their self-review reports.**

- A. From the Graduate Division
  - 1. Time required to complete graduate degrees.
  - 2. Completion rate.
  - 3. Faculty participation in dissertation direction and service on dissertation committees.
  - 4. Summary and analysis of information obtained from graduate student exit questionnaires.
- B. From Resource Planning & Budget: Planning & Analysis Office:
  - 1. Faculty
    - a. Budgeted Faculty FTE – 5 years (Ladder-rank faculty + Lecturers with Security of Employment) [Source: CAL PROFILES<sup>6</sup>].
    - b. Actual Faculty FTE – 2 years [Source: Faculty Instructional Activity Reports (FAIAR Report 4)].
  - 2. Undergraduate Education [Source: CAL PROFILES]
    - a. Assigned majors for last 5 years.
    - b. Course enrollment activity for last 5 years.
      - (1) Counts of enrollments arrayed by level (Lower Division, Upper Division) for all unit-bearing courses (i.e., regularly scheduled classes and independent studies).
      - (2) Average enrollment for unit-bearing classes.

- (3) Percent of students enrolled that are majors within the home unit (e.g., Art History majors taking Art History courses), outside the unit (e.g., all other majors taking Art History courses), and undeclared (all undeclared students taking Art History courses).
      - (4) Student Credit Hours (SCH), year average basis.
    - c. Undergraduate degrees granted for the last 5 years.
  - 3. Graduate Education [Source: CAL PROFILES]
    - a. Number of graduate applications for admission and number admitted for the last 5 years.
    - b. Course enrollment activity for the last 5 years.
      - (1) Counts of enrollments for all unit-bearing graduate courses (i.e., regularly scheduled classes and independent studies).
      - (2) Average enrollment for unit-bearing classes.
    - c. Graduate degrees granted for the last 5 years.
  - 4. Executive Summary(s) [Source: CAL PROFILES]
    - a. Cal Profiles Executive Summary of unit under review where appropriate and/or available.
    - b. Cal Profiles Executive Summary of unit's home college/school where appropriate and/or available.
  - 5. Faculty Workload Measures
    - a. FTE students for last 5 years [Source: DEPTFACT].
    - b. FTE students/Total Faculty FTE for last 5 years [Source: DEPTFACT].
    - c. Courses taught by individual ladder-rank faculty and Lecturers with Security of Employment for previous 2 years, including course enrollments [Source: Planning & Analysis Office].

C. From Sponsored Projects Office\*:

- 1. Faculty activity in soliciting outside research and training funds (i.e., number of proposals and dollar

amounts requested; annual dollars awarded by source and type). [\*NOTE: this data will be available from CAL PROFILES beginning with 11/12/99 release.]

D. From the Office of Student Research:

1. Upper division grade point averages (lower division not available because most undergraduates do not declare their major until they reach upper division status).
2. Average time to complete undergraduate degree (with explanation about how these data are derived)
3. Undergraduate degree completion rates.

**APPENDIX III: Sample Charge and Issues Letters to an External Committee**

October 16, 2001

Professor YYYYYYY  
Department of P P P P P  
Washington University  
Box 1137  
St. Louis, MO 63130

Dear Professor X X X X:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the review of the department of P P P P P P P P P P at the University of California, Berkeley. This letter confirms your visit to campus on November 14, 15 and 16, 2001. Other members of the external review committee are:

P P P P P P P, Yale University  
V V V V V V V, University of Washington  
Z Z Z Z Z Z Z, Duke University

The member(s) of the Academic Senate joining you for your meetings:

L L L L L L L, Psychology  
V V V V V V V, Molecular and Cell Biology  
B B B B B B B, Plant and Microbial Biology

The first day of the review will begin at 6:00 PM in The Faculty Club, Louis-Latimer Room. Representatives of the Chancellor's Office, various administrators, members of the Academic Senate leadership, and the Dean of the College of Letters and Science will welcome your committee and provide a brief orientation. Following their departure, the Chair of the department of P P P P P P P P P P will join you for dinner and discussion. The second day will consist of interviews with faculty and students in the department, followed by a dinner meeting with representatives from P P P P P P P P P P. On the third day there will be additional time for discussion with P P P P P P P P P P faculty and students, as needed. Before you depart, you will be provided with appropriate resources to aid you in completing your written report. We also plan to schedule a brief exit interview with senior administrators and Academic Senate leaders prior to your departure from campus.

We are pleased to offer you a \$1,500 honorarium upon completion of your report. The campus will also reimburse you for standard airfare and customary food and travel expenses upon submission of original receipts. Your room reservations have already been made at the Men's Faculty Club on campus.

Please find enclosed the Self-Review Report prepared by P P P P P P P P P P as well as a list of issues for your committee to consider as you review the department.

If you have any questions in connection with your visit or would like assistance with travel arrangements, please contact Jane Fink, Review Coordinator, at (510) 643-1814 or via e-mail at [jhfink@uclink4.berkeley.edu](mailto:jhfink@uclink4.berkeley.edu).

We look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mason  
Dean

Jeffrey Reimer  
Associate Dean (Program Reviews)

cc:

PROC

enc. Departmental Self Review Report  
External Committee Charge

## PPPPPPPPPP Review

---

### Issues to the Committee

1. What is the Department's scholarly focus? Is the balance between the various specialties appropriate?
2. How is the Department viewed outside of Berkeley? You may wish to consult with various rankings, such as the NRC ranking, and perhaps the popular media, with caution, of course.
3. Are the Berkeley directions unique within the University of California, or are they duplicated on other campuses? Is it possible or desirable to share courses and faculty with neighboring campuses for those areas with sparse student populations?
4. Could the Department collaborate better with other departments on campus to strengthen their undergraduate and graduate programs?
5. Is the undergraduate major coherent and well articulated? Do they assess learning and modify their program/teaching in response to their assessments? Are undergraduates well advised and mentored?
6. Are the requirements and curricula for graduate degrees well designed? Are the graduate students recruited, advised, and supported appropriately? Are they properly mentored in the research and teaching activities? Are they appropriately prepared for professional practice, whether in academia or not?
7. Does the Department provide adequate mentoring and oversight of Postdoctoral Scholars?
8. Are the younger faculty given the opportunity to succeed in research and teaching activities? Does the level of scholarship promised by the young faculty meet or exceed that already demonstrated by the senior faculty?
9. Please evaluate staff support, infrastructure, and space. Does this support structure support the Department's educational goals?
10. All department review committees must address the question of possible dis-establishment or reduction in size of the departments/units/programs within the area of review. This is to allow our limited resources to be used to consolidate and strengthen programs and to pursue those new initiatives that are necessary in order that Berkeley can retain and enhance its academic stature.
11. The Academic Senate and Administration requires that the diversity of the faculty and student body with regard to women and underrepresented groups be assessed.

Does the department have plans for recruitment/retention of these groups? Are their plans being assessed and modified as necessary? What are the limitations to success in these efforts?

12. Insert special issues here that derive from cognizant dean, etc.