

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW



UC BERKELEY GUIDE FOR THE REVIEW OF EXISTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

<http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr/guide/guide.pdf>

Last revised October 2009

CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Review of Existing Instructional Programs | 4 |
| Step 1: Selection of Programs for Review | 4 |
| Figure 1: Progression Chart | 5 |
| Step 2: Determining Self-Study Issues | 6 |
| Step 3: Self-Study and OPA Data Summary | 6 |
| Step 4: External Review Committee and Senate Liaison – Selection and Charge | 8 |
| Step 5: External Review Committee Visit to Campus | 9 |
| Step 6: Report Distribution and Responses from Senate Comtes | 10 |
| Step 7: Wrap-up Meeting | 10 |
| Step 8: The Unit Response to the PROC Recommendations | 11 |
| Confidentiality Policy Regarding Academic Program Review Reports | 11 |
| Appendix I. Historical Background | 12 |
| Appendix II. Authority for Conducting Reviews | 14 |
| Appendix III. Nine-Year Cycle of Academic Program Reviews | 16 |
| Appendix IV. Self-Study Questions for Departments & Schools | 17 |
| Appendix V. Sample Template for External Review Committee Visit | 25 |

Introduction

The Academic Program Review is designed to enhance the educational mission of the University of California, Berkeley, by providing opportunities for programs and departments, and the university as a whole, to assess and improve its teaching and scholarship. We consider each review a rare opportunity for the unit and the campus to take a comprehensive look at the unit, to evaluate its opportunities and challenges, and to assess its future. Such a review process allows the campus to pursue exciting new paths of inquiry and discovery, while also sustaining excellence in each scholarly area.

Our goal is for the review process to take no more than 18 months. The emphasis of the reviews is on forward planning, informed by analysis of recent trends, with units identifying through the self-study and the review process, the necessary steps to maintain excellence and to correct deficiencies. It is not expected that the unit under review will address issues in the course of the review, but rather will develop plans to do so in a timely fashion following the review. The Office of the Provost expects one of the focus areas for each unit will be its undergraduate program.

The centerpiece of the review process is the unit's self-study. It is expected that this self-study will express the unit's unique culture and provide an opportunity for reflection and critical assessment of the unit's scholarly directions and academic programs. The self-study should involve an assessment of strengths and deficiencies and a strategy to meet the opportunities and challenges that the unit anticipates over the next eight years. Within this framework, the unit should emphasize one to three key areas for in-depth examination. In addition, the Dean, Provost and the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC), a joint faculty-administrative committee, may specify one or two additional areas for in-depth analysis.

Each review includes an extramural review component, the External Review Committee, comprised of three to five distinguished scholars selected for their expertise, demographic attributes and institutional affiliation. Prior to their visit they receive copies of the Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) summary of statistical data, the unit's self-study, and a charge letter signed by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP) and the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities (VP-TLAPF). They spend one to one-and-a-half days visiting the unit, depending on its size and range of subfields, and they spend an additional day writing their report.

The role of the Academic Senate is critical to the review process. Five committees (the Graduate Council, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, the Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities, and the Committee on Academic Planning and Resources Allocation) are represented on the PROC. In addition, each External Review Committee is accompanied by a Senate member who serves as the Academic Senate Liaison and who writes an independent review following the external visit. The Senate assigns a member of each committee represented on the PROC to be involved in the review of each unit; these members receive a copy of the OPA statistical summary and the unit's self-study prior to the drafting of the charge letter to the external review committee and are provided the opportunity to identify key areas to which they want

the external committee to pay particular attention. Subsequent to the visit, the Senate representatives receive the External Review Committee report, with a factual corrections addendum, if necessary, from the unit, the Senate Liaison's report, and the unit's response. Each Senate committee prepares a commentary on these reports which is then reviewed by the Divisional Council of the Berkeley Academic Senate (DIVCO) and sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities (VP-TLAPF).

For departments in the College of Letters and Science, the Letters and Science Executive Committee submits salient curricular issues to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy for consideration by the units in completing their self-study or for input into the charge letter. The Letters and Science Executive Committee participates in L&S reviews in a role which parallels the role of the five committees of the Academic Senate.

This review guide was prepared in response to the Program Review Task Force (for "Historical Background", see Appendix I). The intention is to re-examine and amend the academic program review process as appropriate to provide additional support to units under review and to facilitate input into the process from the Academic Senate, L&S, and PROC. This may necessitate occasional revisions to the Guide.

The authority for these guidelines rests on the Principles for Program Reviews strategic plan endorsed by the 2001-2002 Berkeley Division Chair David Dowall, as well as written authority from Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Paul Gray (Appendix II).

The Academic Program Review website is available at <http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr>. It provides various sections clarifying the process and includes this Guide, contact information for support staff, and FAQs.

Review of Existing Instructional Programs/Units

Step 1: Selection of Units for Review

An eight-year cycle (see Appendix III) (extended to nine years for the duration of the budget crisis) for the review of units has been established by the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC), in consultation with the cognizant deans, based on the timing of the previous review and an equitable annual distribution of reviews per dean. The PROC consists of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP), the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities (VP-TLAPF), the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare (VP-AAFW), the Graduate Division Dean (GD), and the Chairs of the Graduate Council (GC), Budget and Interdepartmental Relations (BIR), Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities (SWEM), the Committee on Academic Planning and Resources Allocation (CAPRA), the Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities, and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning and Analysis (OPA). Divisional Council makes its suggestions known through the Senate committees that are represented on the PROC and through a summary letter. A representative of the L&S Executive Committee is invited to participate in the wrap-up meetings for departments in the College of Letters and Science.

A brief, graphic representation of the academic review process is found in Figure 1, with a more detailed narrative in the sections which follow.

Figure 1
Progression, Responsibilities, and Support for Academic Program Reviews

| | Phase 1: Centrally available data collected and analyzed | Phase 2: Department conducts self-study | Phase 3: External review committee visits | Phase 4: Department and Senate respond; outcome letter sent |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Timeline | | | | |
| Department responsibilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify comparable departments (internal and external) • Provide annotated list of possible external reviewers and • Nominations for Senate Liaison | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty, staff, students engage in strategic discussions • Review/request OPA data • Write self-study (due 8 weeks before visit)* • Design the visit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with review team (usually 1 day) • Check reviewers' report for factual errors (due in 2 weeks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write response to the external review & Senate Liaison reports (due in 6 weeks) |
| Primary campus support | Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) | Center for Organizational & Workforce Effectiveness (CORe) | Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities | Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities |
| Primary Campus Contacts: | Elizabeth Wilcox 3-8578; ewilcox@berkeley.edu | Katherine Mitchell 3-8406; kam@berkeley.edu | Anya Grant 2-9018; anyag@berkeley.edu | Anya Grant 2-9018; anyag@berkeley.edu |

* For assistance with setting learning goals and assessment criteria, contact Robert Schlick at 643-1171 or rschlick@berkeley.edu.

Keep in mind each review's three audiences: the Department, Provost and Vice Provosts, and the Academic Senate.

Step 2: Determining Self-Study Issues

The VP-TLAPF notifies the chairs of the units and their cognizant deans of the upcoming review. A luncheon “entrance meeting” is hosted by the VP-TLAPF, including the Assistant VP, Office of TLAPF, the department chair or dean of the professional school, and the MSO/DOA, to discuss the review process in general.

Subsequently, the unit head, or their designate, and the MSO/DOA meet with staff from the VP-TLAPF’s office, the Office of Planning and Analysis, the Chancellor’s Strategy and Alignment (CSA) group and the Educational Development Office (for units with undergraduate majors), for the “kick-off meeting” scheduled by the VP-TLAPF’s staff in consultation with the chair/professional school dean, soon after the luncheon to address questions the unit may have.

The PROC may recommend a specific issue or issues for the unit to consider in its self-study. Also, the VP-TLAPF contacts the cognizant dean to establish additional salient issues to be addressed in the unit’s self-study. The issues are communicated to the unit by the VP-TLAPF and by the “Questions to the Department” at the conclusion of the data summary provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (OPA), with the expectation that they will be addressed in the self-study. The unit is also expected in the course of its self-study deliberations to identify additional issues that it wishes to consider.

Key issues identified by the PROC, the dean, and those that arise in the self-study are transmitted to the External Review Committee in its formal charge letter.

Step 3: Self-Study and OPA Data Summary

Each unit under review conducts a self-study as part of its strategic planning process, focusing on areas of priority to the unit, including in its discussion topics enumerated in Appendix IV, "Self-Study Questions for Departments and Schools", and additional issues highlighted by the PROC, and other salient issues identified when the review is initiated. The deadline for the self-study is dictated by the schedule for the arrival of the external visiting committee, i.e., two months prior to the external committee visit. To comply, the unit submits 31-33 (depending on number of external reviewers) bound and one unbound, double-sided, copies of the self-study and one electronic copy to the office of the VP-TLAPF.

To facilitate the unit’s completion of their self-study, the OPA, in consultation with the unit, provides a summary and analysis of the statistical data that pertains to their unit, comparable campus peers, and external peer departments when available. Such data includes information on the unit’s resources (e.g., financial, faculty, staff, and space), programs (undergraduate and graduate programs, course curriculum, and student satisfaction surveys), faculty characteristics (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender, and salary), research activity, and faculty workload). In addition, the summary highlights specific trends, comparisons and potential issues for the unit to consider. By providing this information the unit can focus on the major issues and questions for their program, rather than on data compilation and analysis.

At the time the OPA submits its completed data summary and analysis to the unit, an optional “action planning” meeting may be scheduled, at the unit’s discretion, by the VP-TLAPF’s staff with the department chair or professional school dean, the MSO/DOA, and

representatives of the VP-TLAPF's and OPA's offices—and in selected instances the CSA's—to review the data and the questions in this Guide which form the foundation of the self-study.

The OPA summary and all data tables are bound by the OPA and paired with the self-study by the VP-TLAPF's office for distribution to reviewers.

Deliberations for completing the self-study are central to the review process. It is expected that the self-study will provide the unit with an opportunity for reflection and critical assessment of the unit's scholarly directions, as well as a celebration of its achievements and successes. The self-study will show how scholarly directions (i.e., in instruction, research, and service) affect the academic programs of the unit. The self-study should involve an assessment of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges that the unit anticipates over the next eight to nine years. Such an assessment will naturally draw on any current academic plan of the unit but should go beyond any current plan both in its critique and in its strategic plan. Examples of areas that might be selected for in-depth analysis are: undergraduate education, relations with cognate ORUs, departments, or UGIS programs, extramural or private support, matching new research directions and faculty recruitment, or graduate student recruitment. In many instances, the self-study evolves into a strategic plan. (In other cases, a strategic plan is the first step undertaken by the unit at the conclusion of the review.)

The unit's faculty are the key players in the development of the self-study; they may also choose to consult with the heads of related academic programs, such as ORUs and institutes. Opportunities for staff, graduate and undergraduate students to provide input to the self-study are essential. This input may be reported in a variety of ways, although the Graduate Council and the Committee on Educational Policy would prefer "raw" student comments to be included.

Appendix IV provides the specific guidelines for the self-study; this appendix is being reviewed and modified on an on-going basis and thus is a "living" document. The Guide is available online on at the program review website (<http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr>) where the current version is available to users.

To reiterate, the self-study should be completed by the unit and transmitted to the office of the VP-TLAPF no later than two months prior to the External Review Committee's visit. The External Committee, the Senate Liaison, the PROC, the cognizant dean, the L&S Executive Committee for L&S departments, and the five Senate committee representatives receive copies of the self-study (and the OPA data summary). Submission of the self-study two months prior to the visit of the External Review Committee provides two weeks for the Senate committees to pose questions, if any, for the units to respond to the VP-TLAPF in writing prior to the arrival of the External Review Committee. Meeting the deadline also provides sufficient time for drafting the charge letter to the ERC, circulating it to PROC for review, and obtaining the signatures of the EVCP and VP-TLAPF.

During the 18 months of the review, if there are significant changes in any key areas reported in the data summary or self-study, such as the successful recruitment of an underrepresented minority faculty member, we encourage units to report this to the VP-TLAPF's office.

The representatives from the L&S Executive Committee and the five Senate committees (CEP, GC, BIR, SWEM, CAPRA) are invited, after their review of the self-study, to bring to

the attention of the VP-TLAPF any new issues or areas to which they would like the External Review Committee to pay particular attention. The VP-TLAPF will transmit these additional concerns to the committee and to the attention of the Senate Liaison prior to the visit.

Step 4: External Review Committee and Senate Liaison – Selection and Charge

As indicated in Figure 1 above, during this first phase of the review, the chair/professional school dean is asked to provide the VP-TLAPF with four lists: 1) a ranked list of 10-15 faculty nominees (depending upon the size of the unit) from peer institutions who could serve on the External Review Committee - professional schools may include a local practitioner whose expertise is relevant - annotate the list with institutional affiliation, subfield expertise, and contact information; 2) four to six UCB faculty nominees who could serve as Senate Liaison; 3) a list of three comparison departments on the Berkeley campus, and 4) a list of two to four comparison peer institution departments or schools. Comparison data for Berkeley and the outside institutions will be supplied by the OPA, if available.

In selecting potential external reviewers, department chairs/professional school deans are asked to observe the following guidelines:

In the achievement of the primary goal of the review—a rigorous, objective, intellectually up-to-date examination of the unit and all its practices—the selection of appropriate External Reviewers is critical. In selecting potential reviewers, units should list nominees who fulfill these criteria:

- scholars who are widely acknowledged to be of national and/or international eminence, who are also noted for good judgment and objectivity
- individuals connected with, and with good experience in, departments and institutions of comparable rank and type
- scholars reflective of the gender and ethnic diversity in the field
- scholars representative of the major subfields within the department and the discipline; and those with broad knowledge of the discipline as a whole

It is equally important, to avoid bias or the appearance of bias, to avoid nominating individuals with prior recent (within 10 years), strong connection with the unit under review, as for instance former students (or teachers) of current faculty or former UCB faculty, or those with substantial collaborative research associations (or strong personal ties) with UCB faculty. If this is not possible, then units should disclose any potential conflicts of interest of suggested external reviewers when submitting their names.

Units are asked to annotate their list of extramural reviewers as fully as possible, indicating their subfield and specific area(s) of expertise and their home institution, at least, if not a complete listing of contact information.

In consultation with the unit dean and the PROC, the Assistant VP, Office of VPTLAPF assembles an External Review Committee of three to five members. A charge letter is sent to the external reviewers, signed by the EVCP and the VP-TLAPF, which highlights for the reviewers' consideration issues which have been raised by PROC as noted above. In general, the committee is directed to examine the OPA data and the unit's self-study, which are sent with the charge letter, and the issues highlighted in the charge letter. A copy of the charge

letter is provided to the department chair or professional school dean in advance of the visit.

Once the department chair/professional school dean supplies the names of four to six campus faculty (not affiliated with the home unit but preferably having some familiarity with it) who might be asked to serve in the role of internal Academic Senate Liaison, the suggested names are sent to the Committee on Committees (COMS). COMS reviews the list and may propose additional names. COMS then supplies a ranked list of at least four potential UCB Senate members who might serve as the Liaison to a specific External Review Committee. The VP-TLAPF's staff approaches the nominees in ranked order and informs COMS (and the unit) of the finalized appointment. One Liaison is appointed to each review.

The Senate Liaison has three principal functions: the first is to provide guidance to the External Review Committee about Berkeley, its particular culture and institutions, and the context in which the unit operates; the second is to act as the Senate's observer of the review, for both its process and its content; and the third is to focus on the general environment in the unit (e.g., faculty-student relations, status of women and ethnic minorities, staff morale, teaching quality and quantity, intra-department faculty relations and collegiality). Although the Liaison's focus is not on curricular or research issues, as a fellow Berkeley faculty member, their observations about the unit's place within the larger intellectual landscape of the campus are valuable.

Following the visit of the External Review Committee (described below) the Senate Liaison receives a copy of the External Review Committee's report. (The Senate Liaison does not participate in the writing of the External Review Committee's report.) The Liaison provides a brief written report, which is addressed to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate although it is transmitted through the VP-TLAPF's office, stating his/her observations. The Liaison's report is due as soon as possible after receiving the ERC's report, within one to two weeks.

Step 5: External Review Committee Visit to Campus

Over a two-plus-day visit (or two and a half days in the case of a large department or school), the External Review Committee and Senate Liaison meet with the unit's faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, and staff, as well as campus administrators (for sample template for External Review Committee visit with department or professional school, see Appendix V). The External Review Committee has a one-hour exit interview with the PROC, Academic Senate committee representatives, and cognizant L&S dean. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare will act as the cognizant dean for professional school reviews. Prior to their departure, the External Review Committee members prepare a report summarizing their strategic assessment of the challenges and opportunities confronting the unit and addressing the issues raised in its charge. The report of the External Review Committee is delivered to the VP-TLAPF at the end of their visit. Following their visit, the External Review Committee members are asked informally to comment on the academic program review process.

The department chair (or dean in the case of a professional school) reviews this report for factual accuracy and reports back to the VP-TLAPF's staff within two weeks.

The external report, with factual corrections attached, and the Senate Liaison's report are distributed to the unit for *faculty, staff, and graduate and undergraduate student review and response*; these responses, including a summary letter from the unit head are due back to the VP-TLAPF within six weeks. These documents remain confidential during the period of the review until the outcome letter is issued (see below).

PROC wishes to highlight the importance of conveying the experience of graduate and undergraduate students, in their own voices. In scheduling the visit of the External Review Committee, for instance, please be certain a cross-section of students - not just honors students, in the case of undergraduates - meet with the reviewers. In gathering input from students for the unit's response to the External Review Committee and Senate Liaison reports, we prefer you submit graduate student responses independently. Any way you can provide input from undergraduates would be valuable; we acknowledge that a separate, independent report is unrealistic.

We ask that you please submit the schedule for the External Review Committee's visit to the office of the VP-TLAPF for review before it is finalized.

Step 6: Report Distribution and Responses from Senate Committees

The External Review Committee report, the Senate Liaison's report, and the responses from the unit under review are distributed to the Senate committee representatives and chairs, the Letters and Science Executive Committee, when appropriate.

The representatives of the five Senate committees, whose chairs serve on the PROC, review the OPA data, the self-study, the External Review Committee's report, the Senate Liaison's report, and the unit's response and prepare written comments. If any of the Senate committees have questions whose answers are critical to preparing their comments, they may submit them to the Berkeley Division chair and the VP-TLAPF, who will share them with the unit and facilitate a rapid response. The written comments are then submitted to the Divisional Council within eight weeks of instruction for its consideration. DIVCO prepares its analysis and transmits it and the Senate committee reports to the VP-TLAPF within two weeks of instruction. If this timeline is not achieved, the PROC Chair, with the consent of the PROC, reserves the right to move the process forward in the absence of a specific report to ensure a timely review.

Under exceptional circumstances, defined as a major disjuncture between the self-study and the External Review Committee's report and the Senate Liaison's report, the Graduate Council, Committee on Educational Policy, Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, or the Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations may elect to convene a single "discussion meeting" with the unit based on the External Review Committee's report, the report by the Academic Senate Liaison, and the responses from the relevant unit, by informing the Division chair and the VP-TLAPF. This meeting shall normally take place within eight weeks of instruction from the submission by the relevant unit of its responses to the External Review Committee's report. The attendees and purpose of the meeting are determined by the relevant Academic Senate committees; the VP-TLAPF convenes the meeting. At the conclusion of the discussion meeting, reports summarizing their views are submitted by the Senate Committees

to DIVCO and the VP-TLAPF. These reports and DIVCO's comments are due three instructional weeks after the discussion meeting has been held. If this timeline is not achieved, the PROC Chair, with the consent of the PROC, reserves the right to move the process forward in the absence of a specific report to ensure a timely review.

Step 7: Wrap-Up Meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to make final recommendations to the unit. All review reports, including the DIVCO response, are distributed to all PROC members. The “wrap-up” meeting for the unit review is hosted by the VP-TLAPF, as the PROC chair. The meeting brings PROC together with an L&S Executive Committee representative and the cognizant college dean, when appropriate, for the final review and assessment of all the review documents, drawing on the general institutional knowledge and areas of responsibility of the meeting participants. As mentioned above, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare acts as the cognizant dean for professional school reviews.

The result of the wrap-up meeting is a draft of an “outcome” letter addressed to the department chair or professional school dean that summarizes the review findings and recommends actions to address them. The letter includes a required timetable for the unit to take action to address the findings. It also includes follow-up actions to be undertaken by the School or College, and the campus. The letter is composed by the PROC chair and reviewed by the PROC and cognizant dean. It is signed by the EVCP and the VP-TLAPF.

The outcome letter is formally transmitted to the unit, which concludes the review. Copies are sent to the PROC, Vice Chancellors, Academic Senate Chair, the chairs of CEP, GC, BIR, SWEM, CAPRA, the cognizant Dean, and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning and Analysis. At this point, all review reports and the outcome letter become part of the public record.

Step 8: Follow-Up: The Unit Response to the PROC Recommendations

The unit is expected to take actions to address the findings of the program review. The outcome letter designates the timeline for acting on the recommendations. The unit is expected to report on actions it has taken as part of its annual FTE request to the cognizant dean (or in the case of the professional schools, to the VP-AAFW), unless otherwise negotiated at the wrap-up meeting. The cognizant dean is expected to comment on the unit's progress in his/her annual FTE request. When indicated in the outcome letter, the unit head and Equity Advisor are expected to meet mid-way between reviews with SWEM to discuss progress toward improvements in equity and inclusion based on recommendations generated by the prior review. The VP-TLAPF is responsible for maintaining a database of initiatives undertaken in response to the recommendations; the annual meeting of the PROC will devote time to reviewing the progress on these recommendations.

Confidentiality Policy Regarding Academic Program Review Reports

It is the policy of the University of California at Berkeley that reports generated during Academic Program Reviews will be considered confidential until a final outcome letter is sent to the chair (or dean) of the department (or School) by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Facilities. “Confidential,” means

that their circulation is restricted to members of the department (or School) under review (including faculty, staff and students), members and staff of the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC), and members and staff of the committees of the Academic Senate that are involved in the review. Once the outcome letter has been sent, all reports are considered to be public documents. “Public” is defined, according to the Office of the General Counsel to the Regents of the University of California, to mean that the documents will be made available upon request, but also that any personal information related to individual employee performance shall be redacted before the request for documents is granted.

Appendix I. Historical Background

The earliest documents regarding academic review in the University of California system are from 1966. In October of that year, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) discussed the idea of program reviews and confirmed the need for five-year reviews in accordance with a resolution passed by the American Council on Education. The first official review on the Berkeley Campus, as we know the process today, concerned the Department of French and was conducted jointly in 1971 by Sanford S. Elberg, Dean of the Graduate Division, and Walter Knight, Dean of the College of Letters and Science. The next review (of the Department of Sociology) was conducted by the Graduate Division alone. This review was the first that specifically called for a response from the Department. The next step was to make such reviews more systematic and part of regular campus review activity.

In January 1981, a special Committee on the Graduate Division, chaired by Professor Martin Trow, reported to the Chancellor. The committee’s report commented on the review procedures and recommended that simultaneous rather than separate reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs be conducted. It also recommended a ten-year cycle of departmental program reviews by the Graduate Council in coordination with the College of Letters and Science and the professional schools.

In August 1997, The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Carol Christ appointed an Academic Planning Board Working Group to consider changes to the current Instructional Program/Unit Review Process. The working group was chaired by Professor Philip Cowan. Many changes in the program review process were implemented at that time.

In the fall of 2002 an Academic Program Review Working Group (chaired by Associate Dean in the Graduate Division Jeffrey Reimer) was charged with revising the academic program review process and proposing an organizational structure for program reviews that meets criteria that were spelled out in a charge letter from EVCP Paul Gray. This charge was informed by a Program Review Task Force (Professor Zacheus Cande and Reimer, co-chairs, 2001-2002) report provided to Academic Senate Chair David Dowell in 2002. The revised process also incorporated recommendations expressed by the Program Review Task Force (Cande/Reimer, co-chairs, 2001-2002) and the Strategic Academic Planning Committee (Dowall and Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Facilities William Webster, co-chairs, June, 2002). New policies and procedures and new structures were designed. The Academic Program Review Working Group agreed on the following goals of the review process:

- Move oversight for program reviews to a central administrative office, under Vice Provost's purview.
- Make program reviews more timely, and on a more frequent cycle, as expressed by the Academic Senate and the Strategic Academic Plan.
- Maintain a review process that is faculty-driven.
- Develop the potential of the program review process to promote key campus objectives within a decentralized organizational culture.
- Create a structure for departmental self-study that is flexible and responsive to the individual needs of the department.
- Reaffirm the importance of statistical data in developing unit self-studies and provide more centralized support to departments in preparation and interpretation of such data.
- Assure that units address student-learning outcomes in discipline-specific ways.
- Create better integration between external and internal reviews.
- Maintain a program review process that is distinct from professional or specialized accreditation.
- Make the cognizant dean's role in program review more prominent, especially as a means of promoting departmental follow-up and accountability.

The Working Group also agreed to the following recommendations:

- Create a permanent joint Academic Senate/Administration committee, with appropriate staff support, to oversee the academic program review process. (The Program Review Oversight Committee – PROC)
- Identify an institutional home for the academic program review process to be centrally coordinated within a single administrative unit.
- Incorporate the criteria for evaluating departmental efforts in undergraduate education into the criteria for all academic program reviews, including a focus on student learning outcomes.
- Convene a single external review committee with an Academic Senate Liaison.
- Require surveys of undergraduate majors and graduate students for all program reviews.
- Provide sufficient resources to ensure timely periodic reviews of academic units every eight years as recommended by the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate.
- Streamline the process that occurs after an academic program review has taken place, clarifying who needs to read and comment on the report and in what timeframe.
- Assure that the cognizant deans are involved in follow-up actions as a result of the academic program review report.
- Create a mechanism for regular follow-up that will enable the campus to evaluate progress and outcomes resulting from recommended action.

APPENDIX II. AUTHORITY FOR CONDUCTING REVIEWS

The Academic Senate derives its authority for the review of academic programs from the following excerpts from The Regents' Standing Orders, and Bylaws of the Academic Senate and of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate:

STANDING ORDER OF THE REGENTS

105.2 Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate

(b) The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned.

BYLAWS OF THE BERKELEY DIVISION

PART I. BERKELEY DIVISION

1. FUNCTIONS

The Berkeley Division is a committee of the Academic Senate. It

- Organizes, selects its own officers and committees, adopts rules for the conduct of its business;
- Receives and considers reports and recommendations from the Faculties of colleges and schools located wholly or partly on the Berkeley Campus, from its Divisional committees, from local administrative officers, and from other Divisions;

4. DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

C. Duties

The Divisional Council has the following responsibilities and authority:

1. Acts on behalf of the Division on matters other than legislative matters retained by the Division.
2. Receives and distributes to the appropriate agency or agencies reports from Standing and Special Committees of the Division and from academic program and Organized Research Unit review committees.
3. Coordinates activities of Divisional Standing and Special Committees.

16. BUDGET AND INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS

B. Duties

It represents the Division in all matters relating to appointments and promotions and makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to the quality of the faculty.

35. EDUCATIONAL POLICY

B. Duties

Considers and reports upon matters involving questions of educational policy; and makes recommendations to the Chancellor on the establishment and disestablishment of academic programs. [from bylaws]

Represents the Division in all matters relating to educational policy, including significant changes in the allocation of campus resources.

37. GRADUATE COUNCIL

B. Duties

The Council exercises administrative and coordinating functions in the Graduate Division at Berkeley in accordance with Senate Bylaw 330.

3. Set policy and standards for... (ellipsis is in bylaws document)
11. Regulate in other ways the graduate work of the Division with a view to the promotion of research and learning, especially through its regular reviews of current graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness

BYLAWS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Title II. List of Standing Committees: Their Powers and Duties

6. Administrative: ... shall pass upon graduate program reviews and shall make recommendations to the Council for improvement of all graduate programs following such reviews.

43. STATUS OF WOMEN AND ETHNIC MINORITIES

B. Duties

- To stimulate and aid all departments in strengthening their efforts to foster and achieve equality of opportunity for women and minorities; [15]
- To conduct continuous review of all problems concerning the status of women and ethnic minorities on the Berkeley Campus; and
- To report to the Division annually on the progress of the Campus in achieving equality of opportunity for women and minorities

APPENDIX III. Academic Program Review 9-Year Cycle

| College/Div | Total Units | 2005-06 <u>Year 1</u> | 2006-07 <u>Year 2</u> | 2007-08 <u>Year 3</u> | 2008-09 <u>Year 4</u> | 2009-10 <u>Year 5</u> | 2010-11 <u>Year 6</u> | 2011-12 <u>Year 7</u> | 2012-13 <u>Year 8</u> | 2013-14 <u>Year 9</u> | 2014-15 <u>Year 1</u> (recycle) |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Arts & Humanities | 19 | Music (92) Art Hist (93) | Philo (08) German (08) | Scand (08) NES (97) Art Pract (09) | Ital (93) Comp Lit (92) Rhetoric (95) | Film (NA) SSEAS (96) | E Asia (99) | Slavic (00) French (01) | English ('06) Classic (99) | Theater/Dance (05) Span/Port (04) | Music (07) Art Hist (08) |
| Social Sciences | 12 | African Am (NA) Pol Sci (92) | Geog (08) Psych (08) | Anthro (99) | Eth St. (93) | Linguist (00) | | Econ (05) | History (05) Women (03) | Socio (06) Demogr (01) | African Am (07) Poli Sci (07) |
| Professional Schools | 9 | Education (94) | Info (07) Journl (07) | Law (94) | | Busines (98) Pub Pol (96) | Soc Wel (98) | Optomty (90) | | Publ Hlth (05) | Education (07) |
| Chemistry | 2 | | | | | Chem (00) | | | ChemEn (05) | | |
| Engineering | 7 | Civil (91) | Bioeng (08) | MatSci (09) | EECS (00) | | Nuclr (97) | Mechan (02) | | Civil (06) | IEOR (05) |
| Phy Sci | 5 | Statistics (90) | Math (08) | Astro (09) | Erth PS (93) | | | Physics (05) | | | Statistics (07) |
| ERG/HWNI | 2 | | | HWNI (NA) | | | | | ERG (90) | | |
| Bio Sci | 3 | | | | PE (NA) | | MCB (03) | | Int Bio (05) | | |
| Nat Res | 4 | | | Agr Ec (09) | | | ESPM (05) | | Plant Bio (03) | Nutrition (05) | |
| Envr Des | 3 | City & Reg (93) | | | Arch (93) | | LndArch (03) | | | | City & Reg (07) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Reviews | 66 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 |

APPENDIX IV. OUTLINE FOR SELF-STUDY TO BE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS SELECTED FOR REVIEW

I. OVERVIEW

A key component of the review process is the self-study by the unit. This self-study focuses on strategic thinking and planning to support the unit's programmatic goals and intellectual and academic endeavors. The deadline for the self-study is dictated by the timing of the arrival of the external visiting committee and is due two months prior to their arrival. The unit is required to provide the Academic Program Review office with 31-35 (depending on the number of external reviewers) double-sided, bound copies of the self-study; one double-sided, unbound copy; and one electronic copy. The cover page of the bound copies should be colored, 65-pound card stock.

The PROC may designate specific areas, such as undergraduate education or departmental diversity, as critical areas for review in each unit's self-study. An important outcome of the study may be the identification of other issues the unit wishes to address and about which they may also wish to seek advice from the external review committee. Issues may also be identified by the dean or chair or L&S Executive Committee, where appropriate, as the review unfolds. Key issues identified by the unit, the PROC, the L&S Executive Committee or dean will be transmitted to the External Review Committee (and the assigned Senate Liaison) in their formal charge letter.

The review document requires that each unit think strategically and present a coherent vision of its short- and long-term plans. The unit should encourage all faculty, students, and staff to participate in generating ideas, analyzing information, creating proposals, and making decisions.

The self-study document should reflect the unit's culture and must include the following elements:

- A. A brief description of the goals and mission of the graduate and undergraduate programs; description of areas of excellence.
- B. A brief description of two to three specific areas for in-depth analysis, established through a critical assessment of the unit's strengths and weaknesses, challenges and opportunities. This assessment should include a review of how this unit sees itself in a national and, if appropriate, international context.
- C. A discussion of new scholarly directions, research plans, curricular or degree program changes, faculty recruiting, and plans for maintaining and enhancing excellence and diversity of faculty and students over the next eight to nine years. The nature of the research, teaching, and scholarly enterprise should be summarized here. Given the persistence of budgetary constraints, the discussion should include ways in which the unit can be strengthened without receiving additional resources.

II. QUESTIONS TO GUIDE THE SELF-STUDY

A. Mission and Strategic Position: *It is helpful to draft responses to these questions at the beginning of the self-study and then to revisit, revise, and affirm your responses after answering the questions which follow.*

- 1) What is the unit's intellectual agenda in the context of current trends in its discipline/field? Do changes in the discipline/field suggest the unit should reexamine its mission or program focus?
- 2) What is the unit's reputation and what makes it distinctive vis a vis its peers nationally and internationally?
- 3) Where does the unit fit in the ecology of the campus? Describe links with other units on campus, such as joint faculty appointments, cross-listed courses, shared undergraduate and graduate service courses and enrollments. Analyze whether there is any overlap in resources and programmatic goals. Also, note and discuss any links with research units. Analyze how these links might be strengthened.
- 4) What are the three to four critical challenges and opportunities facing the unit?

B. Faculty

Describe the success of your faculty in meeting the unit's scholarly mission. **Attach an abbreviated, one-page curriculum vitae for all faculty members, including continuing lecturers and adjuncts.**

1. Quality of Instruction:

- a) 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?
- b) What are the incentives and rewards for faculty contributions to both the undergraduate and graduate teaching enterprise?
- c) What teaching resources does the unit use to enhance the quality of instruction (i.e., GSIs, web resources, professional practitioners)?
- d) 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?
- e) Describe possible innovations in teaching that are contemplated.

2. Faculty teaching loads. (See Section VII.5.).

- a) Describe the internal policy for making teaching assignments, i.e., information on expected average teaching load per faculty member in the unit. Update the departmental policy provided by the Office of Planning & Analysis, if necessary.
- b) What are the actual faculty workloads currently?
- c) What percentage of courses is taught by: a) ladder-rank faculty, b) lecturers and c) GSIs in lower division; upper division? Please explain the rationale for the pattern of allocation.
- d) How are student credit hours distributed among the academic titles?

3. Faculty Advising and Mentoring

- a) What is the distribution of mentoring and advising responsibilities to faculty and staff, and what methods are used to evaluate their effectiveness?
- b) What are the procedures for faculty oversight of undergraduate special studies courses (e.g., field studies, group studies including DE-Cal courses, independent research)?
- c) How do ladder faculty oversee curriculum taught by Continuing Lecturers, Adjuncts, and other temporary instructors? How do ladder faculty mentor Continuing and Pre-Six Lecturers?
- d) What is the average length of service as graduate, major, and other advisers?
- e) How does the faculty participate in the mentoring of GSIs and their preparation for teaching? What procedures are in place for oversight of GSIs?
- f) How does the faculty provide enough role models, mentoring, and research opportunities that encourage underrepresented students to become more fully represented in their field? Are the diverse faculty unduly burdened because there are too few of them? If so, how are they recognized or compensated?

4. Recruitment Success.

- a) How successful has the unit been in recruiting and retaining top quality faculty?
- b) Describe successful and unsuccessful efforts over the past five years to recruit women and underrepresented minorities. Provide an analysis of obstacles and determinants to successful recruitment. What more could the unit do and what more could central administration do to support the unit in these efforts?
- c) List the job offers made and accepted in the last five years.
- d) Please address how junior faculty are retained. How are they mentored? How well are they included in the intellectual life of the department?

5. Scholarly Activity and Interaction:

- a) Discuss the culture of the department or school and the intellectual interactions that occur.
- b) Provide information on collaborative efforts within and across department and school (if applicable) lines. Discuss the benefits and drawbacks of any collaborative efforts across department and school lines and analyze any overlap in resources and programmatic goals.
- c) Highlight achievements by the faculty, successes in external funding, citations, external or internal awards, etc.
- d) Please address how underrepresented faculty are mentored and retained. Are they fully included in the intellectual life of the department? Are their chosen areas of inquiry and activity appropriately appreciated and rewarded? If such faculty have left in the last review period, what were the causes?

C. Research Programs

- 1) What are the research strengths of the unit?
- 2) What new areas should the unit develop?
- 3) What are the sources of research funding and are they increasing or decreasing?
- 4) How do the research strengths of the faculty support the curriculum?

D. Undergraduate Program

- 1) What are the goals or objectives of your undergraduate program (for majors, minors, and non-majors), e.g., as submitted for the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (<http://education.berkeley.edu/usli.html>)? If you have not submitted a draft proposal to USLI, where are you in the process? [Please do not hold up preparation of your self-study to complete this.] How do you communicate information about your learning goals to your majors and potential majors? How do your specific program requirements and courses help students achieve these goals? Can majors elect from a number of subfields? How do you balance the need to provide service courses for non-majors with the need to provide a sufficient variety of rigorous courses for majors? How well are the goals or objectives being met?
- 2) What constitutes “quality” in undergraduate education in your field? How does your unit assess the quality of your undergraduate program and student outcomes? How does your undergraduate program compare with similar programs at equivalent top-ranked institutions in terms of mission, curriculum, and requirements? What is the unit doing currently to improve its performance?
- 3) In what departmental committees or activities are your undergraduate majors involved? How are student committee members chosen? To what extent does faculty participate in departmental student groups?
- 4) What opportunities are available for your majors for a capstone experience, such as participation in a research project or writing a senior thesis? What proportion of majors complete a capstone experience? How many faculty sponsor independent research projects? How are faculty recognized for directing undergraduate research projects? Does anyone monitor the quality of Independent Studies courses? What are you doing to teach undergraduates to write in the discipline?
- 5) What courses does your program offer which fulfill the American Cultures requirement? Other courses which include topics related to racial, ethnic, cultural or gender diversity?
- 6) How well does faculty expertise reflect the undergraduate courses that should be offered for the major, as well as service courses and other courses for non-majors?
- 7) How are undergraduates advised, both academic advising during their undergraduate years and advising about career and graduate training opportunities after graduation? To what extent and how are faculty involved in advising undergraduates?
- 8) If your major is impacted (i.e., qualified students wishing to major in your unit are not able to be admitted), what is the admissions procedure for the major? What are the student demand and the acceptance rate for four-year students and for transfer students?
- 9) How does the program deal with the special needs of community college and other transfer students? Does the unit have special programs to attract and retain women or underrepresented students?
- 10) If time to graduation is longer than desired, what actions are being taken to ensure that students graduate in a timely manner?

- 11) What are the weaknesses and limitations in your undergraduate program? How could you address these utilizing existing resources and FTE?

E. Graduate Program

- 1) What are the objectives, how are they measured, and how well are they being met?
- 2) What constitutes "quality" in graduate education in your field? How does your unit measure and meet this standard of quality?
- 3) What are the admissions procedures for the graduate program(s), and what is the yield rate (both with and without financial aid)?
- 4) What is the amount of graduate student support and what are the procedures for distributing it?
- 5) What other institutions compete with you for graduate students?
- 6) What constitutes "success" for you in this competition? What limits your ability to "succeed" further?
- 7) Provide the unit's outreach plan to promote diversity in the graduate program. Specifically, what is the role of the affirmative action advisor?
- 8) How does the program pay specific attention to the climate for diverse students and do you have specific measures to ensure their retention and success, as needed? Does the program supply enough role models and research opportunities to encourage underrepresented students to become more represented in their field?
- 9) What are the policies and procedures for the examinations necessary to obtain Masters and Doctoral degrees?
- 10) How are GSI teaching opportunities distributed and evaluated? What are the opportunities for graduate students to obtain training in instruction? What are your requirements for oversight, division of work activities, and mentoring of GSIs by the professor of record?
- 11) How does the training and assignment of GSIs impact the undergraduate curriculum?
- 12) Describe how graduate students are mentored.
- 13) In what departmental committees or activities are your graduate students involved? How are student committee members chosen? To what extent does faculty participate in departmental graduate student groups?
- 14) Show the job placement of your graduate students during the last 5 years.

IV. STAFFING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND OTHER RESOURCES

- 1) How well does the unit's current space meet its research and teaching needs? What are the unit's long-term space needs? Does the unit have sufficient funding to maintain the space it controls?
- 2) How has technology been integrated into the teaching, research, and administrative activities of the unit? Does the unit have sufficient funding to supply and maintain equipment for faculty, students, and staff?

- 3) How reliant is the unit on temporary academic staff (e.g., lecturers, GSIs)? How do they complement the ladder faculty? Would the unit deploy these resources differently if their TAS budget were larger?
- 4) In what ways does staff contribute to and support departmental excellence?
- 5) What are current faculty to staff, and staff to student ratios? How is the level of support measured? Are these adequate?
- 6) How do staff and faculty interact, collaborate and share responsibility for the unit's administrative functions?
- 7) Comment on the morale of staff, as indicated by turnover rates, absenteeism, number of grievance procedures, disciplinary proceedings or mediation, medical or "stress" leave?
- 8) How are staff hired and trained? Are there formal efforts to mentor staff?
- 9) What mechanism does the unit use to establish and nurture outreach and alumni relations?
- 10) Describe the unit's fund raising and development activities.
- 11) Do you track alumni as a potential donor base? If not, are there resources you need to enable you to do so? If so, what are they?

V. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

- 1) Does the unit have a board of external or internal advisors? How is this group selected? How active is this group in providing strategic guidance and, where appropriate, oversight? How can the board be used to best effect?
- 2) Describe how faculty members engage in informed collective discussion on all-important unit issues.
- 3) Describe the role of the chair, vice-chair, and executive committee (if applicable). Provide names of other unit committees.
- 4) Do non-tenured faculty participate in the unit's governance and academic personnel decisions and in the unit's administration? Is there a junior faculty mentoring program?
- 5) Are underrepresented faculty mentored, encouraged, and advised on how best to advance at all levels?
- 6) List all student participation on committees and in other roles in unit's governance.

VI. STATISTICAL DATA

The Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) will collect and coordinate all data for the reviews and provide both a narrative summary and data appendices of the information listed below. This analysis will include, where possible, ten years of trend data and comparable information on selected departments and peer institutions (identified by the unit) in addition to college and campus comparisons. OPA will also address specific issues and areas identified by the unit, PROC, cognizant dean, and/or the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Facilities. All information provided by OPA for the program

reviews will be reviewed by the chair of the PROC before being forwarded to unit chairs. Bound copies of the OPA summary and all data tables and the self-study will be provided to all internal and external reviewers by the Vice Provost's office.

A. Standard Information to be Provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis in Statistical Summary (data from Cal Profiles unless otherwise noted)

1. Summary of Prior Program Reviews/Administrative History

2. Faculty Honors/Awards and Rankings of the Program (various sources)

3. Faculty

- a. Budgeted Faculty FTE – (Incumbent, Permanent, Total Faculty FTE)
- b. Actual (payroll) Permanent Faculty FTE.
- c. Faculty FTE Target [Budget Office]
- d. Demographic Profile--Gender, Ethnicity, and Age of Faculty [HRMS or Academic Personnel]
- e. Average Faculty Salaries [AAU Data Exchange]
- f. Hire and Separation Data [Budget Office]
- g. Year-to-Rank Data [Academic Personnel]
- h. Faculty Climate Survey [Academic Personnel]

4. Departmental Resources

- a. Expenditures by type and source
- b. Academic Staff FTE (Budgeted and Actual)
- c. Staff FTE (Budgeted and Actual)
- d. Assignable Square Feet allocated to the Unit.
- e. Suggested improvements to the unit's webpage to make it more user-friendly and complete.

5. Research and External Funding Sources

- a. Faculty activity in soliciting outside research and training funds (i.e., number of proposals and dollar amounts requested)
- b. Annual dollars awarded by source and type
- c. Total prorated sponsored project awards per permanent faculty FTE.

6. Undergraduate Education

- a. Headcount of majors by gender and ethnicity
- b. Single and multiple majors
- c. Ratio of majors / faculty FTE
- d. Average time to degree
- e. Undergraduate degrees granted
- f. Survey results from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) and/or special program review survey [Office of Student Research]

- g. Number of undergraduate majors participating in research: number writing Honors or Senior Theses [source?]
- h. Placement data if available [Career Center/Clearinghouse]
- i. Other [Quality of students, Student Outcomes]

7. Graduate Education

- a. Number of graduate applications, admissions, and enrollments
- b. Headcount of majors by gender and ethnicity
- c. Ratio of graduate majors to permanently budgeted faculty FTE
- d. Graduate degrees granted
- e. Average time to degree [Graduate Division]
- f. Completion rates
- g. Time to Candidacy (in the future)
- g. Faculty participation in dissertation direction and service on dissertation committees [Graduate Division]
- h. Placement data for graduates [Graduate Division]
- i. Summary and analysis of information obtained from graduate student surveys, including the enrolled student and exit surveys.
- j. Financial Support for new and continuing students

8. Curriculum

- a. Courses Taught by Type of Instructor
- b. Percent of Courses Taught by Ladder Faculty
- c. Course enrollment activity:
 - (1) Counts of enrollments arrayed by level (Lower Division, Upper Division, Graduate) and type (e.g., American Cultures, UG research, freshman and sophomore seminars, etc) 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).
- d. Course offerings (history, cross-listed, and team-taught)
- e. How undergraduates are advised [web site]

9. Faculty Workload Measures

- a. Student FTE by level
- b. Student FTE students/ Faculty FTE ratios
- c. Number of classes per Faculty FTE
- d. Number of Primary Courses Taught per Available Permanent Faculty

10. Executive Summary(s)

- a. Executive Summary of program as provided by the unit in Cal Profiles
- b. Executive Summary of unit's home college/school where appropriate and/or available.

Appendix VI: Sample Template for External Review Committee Visit

Department of Scandinavian, University of California, Berkeley
External Review Committee Schedule for one-day dept. visit
March 5 - 7, 2008

Wednesday, March 5, 2008.....

- Up to 4pm **External Review Committee (ERC) Arrival & Check-in at the Bancroft Hotel**, 2680 Bancroft Way, Berkeley 94704
Phone: 510-549-1000
- 4:15pm **Becky Coulter meets ERC in hotel lobby to escort to California Hall**
- 4:30pm **Welcome by Cathy Koshland**, Vice Provost for Academic Planning & Facilities: **223 California Hall**
Dean Janet Broughton, College of Letters & Science
Associate Dean Susan Schweik, Arts & Humanities
Barbara Spackman, Academic Senate Liaison
External Review Committee Members:
Thomas Dubois, University of Wisconsin
Roberta Frank, Yale University
Mary Kay Norseng, University of California Los Angeles
- 5:45pm **Dean Broughton** escorts the ERC to Adagia Restaurant
- 6 pm **Dinner Meeting: Adagia, 2700 Bancroft Avenue, 647-2300**
Reservations are under: Chair Karin Sanders
Thomas Dubois, Roberta Frank, Mary Kay Norseng,
External Review Committee
Janet Broughton, Dean, College of Letters & Science
Karin Sanders, Chair, Department of Scandinavian
Associate Dean Susan Schweik, Arts & Humanities
Barbara Spackman, Professor and Senate Liaison

Thursday, March 6, 2008.....

- 7:30 am Meet Becky Coulter in the hotel lobby,
Walk to Faculty Club
- 7:45-8:45 Breakfast at The Faculty Club, O'Neill DR

Cathy Koshland, Vice Provost, Academic Planning & Facilities;
Susan Muller, Assoc. Dean, Graduate Division; **Dennis Hengstler**,
 Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Planning & Analysis; **Barbara
 Spackman**, Professor and Senate Liaison; **Susan Rasky**, Representative,
 Graduate Council; **Catherine Gallagher**, Representative, Budget
 Committee; **Niklaus Largier**, Representative, Committee for Educational
 Policy; **Meg Conkey**, Representative, Committee on the Status of Women
 & Ethnic Minorities; **Celeste Langan**, Representative, Committee on
 Academic Planning & Resource Allocation; and the **External Review
 Committee**

- 8:45am Meet Chair Sanders at the Faculty Club
- 9 - 9:15 Department and Department Library Tour
- 9:15-10 Meeting with Chair Sanders, 6407 Dwinelle
- 10-11 Meeting with Graduate Students, 6415 Dwinelle: Benjamin Mier Cruz,
 Monica Hidalgo, Dean Krouk, Carl Olson, Simon Helton
- 11-11:45 Meeting with Undergraduate Students, 6415 Dwinelle: Jessica McMahan,
 Erin McWilliams, Briana Van Epps, Sarah Eriksen, Jeanette Kalchik,
 Justin Farwell
- 11:45-12:15 Meeting with Department Staff, 6415 Dwinelle: Laurie Holland, Kathi
 Brosnan, Sandy Jones, Debra Downey, Elizabeth La Vargas-Baptista,
 Moriah Van Vleet
- 12:15-2 Lunch Break

Meeting with Scandinavian Faculty

- 2:10-2:30 Visit to Distance Learning Language Class with Karen Moller. 33
 Dwinelle
- 2:30-2:50 Carol Clover (Old Norse; Film) 6415 Dwinelle
- 2:50-3:10 John Lindow (Old Norse, Folklore, Finnish) 6415 Dwinelle
- 3:10-3:30 Mark Sandberg (Film and Norwegian) 6415 Dwinelle
- 3:30-3:50 Linda Rugg (Graduate & Undergraduate Adviser. Swedish) 6415
 Dwinelle
- 3: 50-4:10 Karen Moller (Language Coordination) 6415 Dwinelle
- 4:10-4:45 Entire Faculty, followed by refreshments
- 6:30 Dinner with Department Faculty at “Downtown” restaurant

Friday, March 7, 2008.....

7:30-8:40am **Breakfast** at your discretion, **The Hotel Durant**

8:40am Becky Coulter or Anya Grant will meet
ERC at the hotel and escort them to California Hall

9-10:45am Begin Writing ERC Report, **108 California Hall**

Noon– 1 pm **Lunch 108 California Hall**

1:45pm Anya Grant takes ERC to Exit Interview

2-3:00 Exit Interview, **200 California Hall**
Chancellor’s Conference Room

Attendees:

Catherine Koshland, Vice Provost, Academic Planning & Facilities; **Christina Maslach**, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education; **Susan Muller**, Assoc. Dean, Graduate Division; **Dennis Hengstler**, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Planning & Analysis; **Janet Broughton**, Dean, College of Letters & Science; **Barbara Spackman**, Liaison, Academic Senate; **Susan Rasky**, Representative, Graduate Council; **Catherine Gallagher**, Representative, Budget Committee; **Niklaus Largier**, Representative, Committee for Educational Policy; **Meg Conkey**, Representative, Committee on the Status of Women & Ethnic Minorities; **Celeste Langan**, Representative, Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation; **Anya Grant**, Coordinator, Academic Program Reviews

External Review Committee Members

Thomas Dubois, University of Wisconsin; **Roberta Frank**, Yale University;
Mary Kay Norseng, UCLA

3– 4:00 pm **Finish Writing ERC Report 108 California Hall**

Conclusion of External Review Committee Visit