

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEMBERS' HANDBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Senate Regulations Pertaining to the Committee on Educational Policy	
Composition	
Leadership Roles	
Meeting Schedules	
Online Resources	
Undergraduate Program Reviews	5
Composition of Review Subcommittees	
Responsibilities of Committee Members	
Closing Program Reviews in Timely Fashion	
Internal Reviews	
Program Review Subcommittees	7
New Program Proposals	8
Priority Registration Requests	8
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1: Academic Senate By-Laws Pertaining to CEP	9
Appendix 2: CEP Conflict of Interest Statement	10
Appendix 3: UCEP Representative – Summary of Activities	11
Appendix 4: Undergraduate Program Review Procedures	12
Appendix 5: Procedures for Internal Reviews of Undergraduate Programs with ABET	35
Appendix 6: Templates for Writing <i>Findings and Recommendations</i> Reports	37
Appendix 7: Guidelines for Approval of Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs	39
Appendix 8: Guidelines for Establishment of New Undergraduate Programs	44
Appendix 9: Priority Enrollment Policy	46

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is a compilation of relevant bylaws of the Academic Senate related to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), a standing committee of the Senate; various documents and policies prepared by CEP; and descriptions of common practice. The handbook is intended to provide CEP members with an overview of the committee's responsibilities and procedures and to assist them in carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

A. Senate Regulations Pertaining to the Committee on Educational Policy

Senate bylaw 8.12 establishes the duties and membership of the Committee on Educational Policy. It is reproduced in full as **Appendix 1**.

B. Composition

The Committee is composed of at least 15 members. The Committee officers are Chair and Vice Chair. One member of the Committee, serves as the Divisional representative to the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). There are three standing subcommittees that are formed to review proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum. In addition, Undergraduate Program Review Subcommittees will be formed for each undergraduate program review scheduled. These review subcommittees will consist of at least three members, a minimum of two regular Committee members one of which will serve as subcommittee chair and the Committee Chair who serves as an ex officio on all of the review subcommittees. All CEP members will serve on at least one review subcommittee and one program change subcommittee.

Per Bylaw 8.2.5, each committee must annually adopt a Conflict of Interest Statement to ensure committee business is being conducted with the highest possible degree of credibility. The Committee's full Conflict of Interest Statement can be found as **Appendix 2**.

C. Leadership Roles

The **Chair** of the Committee is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Chair's responsibilities include conducting Committee meetings; writing correspondence on behalf of the Committee; representing the Committee on the Academic Senate Executive Council; assisting with the organizing and facilitating of undergraduate program reviews; and assisting with the review proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum.

The **Vice Chair** of the Committee is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Vice Chair serves as Chair in the Chair's absence and along with the Chair, assists with organizing and facilitating graduate program reviews and with reviewing proposed changes to proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum.

The UCEP Representative is appointed by the Committee on Committees. **Appendix 3** below summarizes the duties of the UCEP Representative.

Review subcommittee chairs are appointed by the Chair. Their responsibilities include chairing meetings with the external review team, drafting the concluding reports from the review, and participating in the action implementation meeting (see section on the review subcommittee below).

D. Meeting Schedules

The Committee meets on the first Friday of every month from 10AM to 12PM. Meetings are scheduled with consideration of the Academic Senate meeting schedule to prepare business for submission to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Council, on which the Chair serves, meets twice a month.

E. Online Resources

CEP maintains its own page on the UCR Academic Senate website at <http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=10>. Many materials regarding the policies and procedures of CEP are posted there for the convenience of members and for the campus faculty at large.

CEP also maintains the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy iLearn page that all members have access to. All meeting agendas, proposed program changes, and undergraduate program review information are posted to the iLearn page. In addition, there is an archive that includes information and agendas from past academic years.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Appendices 4 and 5 provide detailed explanations of the processes of conducting external and internal undergraduate program reviews, one of the most important functions of CEP. What follows here is an explanation of practical matters not fully covered in the Appendices, especially those related to the formation of review subcommittees and their duties.

A. Composition of Review Subcommittees

Each Committee member is appointed to serve with at least one other member on one undergraduate program review subcommittee for each year of his/her service on CEP. Over the course of a normal three-year appointment to CEP, each member will serve on at least three review subcommittees. Those who serve as Chair of CEP will serve on all review subcommittees as an ex officio. At the beginning of each academic year, it is the duty of the Council Chair and Analyst to determine the membership of each review subcommittee and to appoint chairs of the subcommittees.

B. Responsibilities of CEP Members

Each undergraduate review subcommittee is thus comprised of at least two members (one or more “regular” members and the CEP Chair as an ex officio). These members share the following duties:

- Review for completeness and accuracy the materials assembled in an electronic binder compiled through a joint effort of faculty and staff from the program under review and the CEP Staff analyst. For a complete overview and listing of the materials included in the electronic binders, please see **Appendix 4**.
- Participate in two meetings with the extramural review team members while they are visiting campus. The first of these meetings is held at the beginning of the first day of the review team’s visit, and the second at the end of the second day. This is the “exit” meeting, when the college dean, appropriate Associate Deans, and VPUE are present, and the extramural review team members provide a preliminary overview of their findings.
- Read the extramural team’s final report when it becomes available (typically two weeks following the review), and also any first-round “corrections of fact” in relationship to the report provided by the program faculty.
- Prepare a draft **Preliminary Findings and Recommendations (F&R)** document that summarizes the major findings of the review and specifies any actions that CEP deems necessary (A template and guidelines for writing Findings and Recommendations is attached as **Appendix 6**). The Preliminary Findings and Recommendations document should be prepared in a timely fashion, no later than two to three weeks following receipt of the corrections of fact from the program.
- Present the Preliminary F&R document at the next regularly scheduled CEP meeting and make any suggested revisions resulting from the discussion with the Committee. After the Committee approves the Preliminary F&R report it is sent to the program for review with a request for a response to the report to be submitted within 2 weeks.

- After the program's response to the Preliminary F&R is received the subcommittee prepares a draft Final Findings and Recommendations Report.
- Present the Final F&R document at the next regularly scheduled CEP meeting and make any suggested revisions resulting from the discussion with the Committee. After the Committee approves the Final F&R report it is sent to the program and appropriate administrators with brief summary of the Action Implementation phase of the review.
- An Action Implementation Meeting is scheduled for the early Fall Quarter after each review. The College Dean, Department or Program Chair, CEP Chair and any remaining review subcommittee members are invited to attend this meeting where a discussion is held about the Committee's actions and progress to address the recommendations made in the Final F&R report. At the conclusion of this meeting, the CEP Chair drafts an Action Implementation Plan for any of the recommendations that still need to be addressed, which details the Committee's specific direction and requests follow up. Typically the program is asked to respond to the Action Implementation during the following quarter with a Compliance Report to the Action Implementation Plan.
- CEP reviews the Compliance Report at their next regularly scheduled meeting and votes to either support the response or request additional follow up. A memo is sent to the program documenting the Committee's response.

C. Closing Program Reviews in Timely Fashion

An important issue for CEP is the timely completion and closing of undergraduate program reviews. There is much potential for slow-downs along the way when deadlines are not met. **CEP members must do their utmost to conform to the schedule presented above.** The Senate staff analyst assigned to CEP will keep everyone on track. The goal is to finalize a review's Final F&R within the academic year that the review was completed in.

D. Internal Reviews and Special Actions

CEP may conduct internal reviews to evaluate undergraduate programs as circumstances warrant. For example, CEP has developed a process with BCoE to conduct internal reviews of engineering undergraduate programs with the utilization of the ABET accreditation report in place of the external review teams report. **Please consult Appendix 5** for the process of conducting internal reviews with ABET.

PROGRAM CHANGE SUBCOMMITTEES

A. Duties

The main responsibilities of the program change subcommittees are to review proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum.

B. Membership

Committee members are appointed to one of three subcommittees (CHASS Subcommittee, CNAS Subcommittee, and Professional Schools (BCoE, GSoE, SoM, & SPP) Subcommittee) based on their home college. The CEP Chair and Vice Chair serve on all Committees as an ex officio and review all proposed changes to curriculum regardless of the college.

C. Schedule

The Subcommittees typically review all proposed changes via email. However, if there is a large amount of proposals meetings of the subcommittee are often scheduled so that the proposals can be discussed together. If a proposal is controversial and requires further discussion it is submitted for review at CEP's next regularly scheduled meeting.

D. Business

Any change to an undergraduate program should be submitted to CEP for review and approval from the College Executive Committee. The changes are submitted in "catalog copy style" which lists the current requirement on the left side of the page (striking deletions), and the proposed changes on the right side of the page (underlining additions); a thorough justification for the change; and include a Coversheet for the request documenting the proposed changes, providing contact information, and identifying programs that may be affected by the change. The CEP guidelines for proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum can be found in **Appendix 7**. Any courses that are affected by a program change must be approved in CRAMS at the time the program change is submitted. If affected courses are not approved in CRAMS, the proposals will be held until the course is approved by the Committee on Courses. It is the subcommittee's responsibility to review the requested change to ensure that the change is appropriate and justified. If the subcommittee has concerns about a proposal, the CEP analyst will communicate those concerns with the College Executive Committee and request a revised document. If a subcommittee has significant concerns about a proposal they will be added to CEP's next scheduled meeting for full discussion by the Committee. Once approved by CEP the program changes are submitted for enclosure on the next Division Meeting's agenda for final approval.

PROPOSALS FOR NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

The format for new program proposals follows the process specified by the Committee in CEP's Process and Guidelines for the Establishment of New Undergraduate Programs, which can be found in **Appendix 8**. Unlike proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum, proposals for new programs are added to CEP's meeting agenda for a review by the full Committee before approval. The outcome of CEP's review is reported to the Senate Chair as part of the Senate Review process of the proposal.

REVIEW OF PRIORITY REGISTRATION REQUESTS

CEP makes the final determination on all priority registration requests as detailed in the Priority Enrollment Policy in **Appendix 9**. Priority registration requests are submitted initially to the Registrar, who then forwards the request to the college Associate Deans for Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) for their review. After this review, the Registrar will forward CEP a report of the outcome of the initial review including the Associate Deans and VCSA's recommendation. The Committee will review the request and recommendation at their next scheduled meeting and will make the final determination of whether priority registration should be granted. The CEP Analyst will send the final determination to the Registrar who will communicate the response to the requesting group and appropriate parties.

APPENDIX 1

Academic Senate By-Laws Pertaining to the Committee on Educational Policy

Chapter 8. Committees of the Division

8.12 Educational Policy

8.12.1 This committee consists of fifteen members including a Chair, a vice Chair, and a member of the Committee on Courses designated by the Committee on Committees. The membership shall include a representative from each of the Colleges. The Committee on Committees will make every attempt also to include representation from each of the Professional Schools. One member of the committee shall serve on the University Committee on Educational Policy. (Am 22 May 86)(Am 10 Jun 91)(Am 30 May 06)(Am 26 Nov 13)(Am 24 May 16)

8.12.2 It is the duty of the committee to consider and report upon such matters of educational policy which may be referred to it by the President, the Chancellor, the Division, or by any committee of the Division. The committee has power to review the educational policy and curricula of all colleges, schools, and University Extension. It is authorized to initiate such studies and to make such reports to the President, the Chancellor, the Division, or University committees as it deems appropriate upon the establishment and disestablishment of curricula, colleges, schools, institutes, departments, bureaus, and the like, and upon legislation or administrative policies of a fundamental character involving questions of educational policy.

8.12.3 The Committee will develop policies for the implementation of campus graduation requirements, including specification of courses or other methods by which requirements may be satisfied. The committee will report such policies to the Division. (En 29 Nov 79)

8.12.4 The committee may take the initiative in recommending innovative programs to the administration and the Division. (En 5 Jun 75)

8.12.5 The committee will establish the procedures for and the sequence of undergraduate program reviews. (En 10 Jun 91)

8.12.6 The committee will periodically initiate reviews of broader undergraduate issues such as freshmen experience, advising, size of classes, seminars, and other critical features related to excellence in undergraduate education at UCR. (En 10 Jun 91)

APPENDIX 2

CEP CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

In situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, it is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes. If a member's spouse, partner, or family member (current, former, or future) brings business before the committee, the member will be automatically recused from all discussion and voting on the motion(s) related to the item of business brought before the Committee.

APPENDIX 3

RIVERSIDE DIVISION REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP) – SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) is the systemwide equivalent of the campus Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Each campus has a representative to UCEP. The Committee on Committees appoints the Riverside Division Representative to UCEP from among the CEP members. This representative serves a two-year term and participates in the activities of the UCEP during that time period. He/She reports on UCEP activities to CEP each month and leads discussions on topics of interest to it.

The membership and activities of UCEP are summarized below:

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee.
- B. Duties. Consistent with [Bylaw 40](#), the Committee shall:
 1. Consider and report on matters referred to it by the President of the University, the Assembly, a Division, or any Senate committee.
 2. Initiate appropriate studies and make reports thereon to the President, the Assembly, or any Division, on the establishment or disestablishment of curricula, colleges, schools, departments, institutes, bureaus, and the like, and on legislation or administrative policies of a fundamental character involving questions of educational policy.
 3. Approve UC undergraduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues.

B. Meeting Schedule and Travel

UCEP meetings are during the year on the first Monday of each month and are held at UCOP - 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, or via telephone or video conferencing.

C. Additional Information

The following link is to the UCEP Reports and Resources page, which includes UCEP reports and links to important policies and processes related to undergraduate education:

<http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucep/reports.html>

APPENDIX 4

Revised August 10, 2020

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

Adopted by the Committee on Educational Policy on 11/29/06, Revised 11/27/12, 03/19/14, 05/21/14, 04/17/15, 02/05/16, 05/26/17, 04/06/18, 03/06/20, 8/10/20

I. Overview

Reviews of undergraduate programs are conducted by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), with the aid of extramural review teams, and supported by the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The review policy has been approved by the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The primary aim of the review process is to help improve undergraduate programs across the campus.

CEP may conduct internal reviews to evaluate undergraduate programs as circumstances warrant. For example, an internal review may be recommended to assess the progress of an undergraduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review, to evaluate the progress of new undergraduate programs, or to evaluate a small program with low enrollment. Please consult Appendix A for full details on internal review procedures. Additionally, internal reviews are conducted for BCoE programs with the ABET accreditation reports. Please consult Appendix B for the process for the internal review of BCoE programs with ABET.

External and/or internal undergraduate program reviews are subject to be conducted remotely when circumstances are present that do not allow for in-person gatherings. A decision to conduct a review remotely will be made by CEP.

The Committee on Educational Policy establishes the sequence of program reviews which is reviewed annually. The sequence can be altered by action of the CEP. At least four programs are reviewed every year (and the goal is that each program will be reviewed at least once every seven years.) The current sequence of reviews is available from the Academic Senate.

II. Program Self Study

The undergraduate program to be reviewed is notified at least in the year preceding their review. At the time of the notification, the program is asked by the CEP Chair to prepare a self-study document, which will be transmitted to the external review team. This will become a part of the permanent record of the program review and will be filed together with the report of the review committee. The program should direct any questions or dialogue concerning the review to the CEP Review Subcommittee Chair and CEP Senate staff analyst. The self-study is no more than five single-spaced pages in length not including data appendices and should be a thoughtful and thorough self-evaluation of the program, based on the participation of the program's faculty, staff and students. The program should provide an electronic copy of their entire self-study package to the CEP.

The self-evaluation document contains the following required seven categories:

- I. Introduction and Contact Information
- II. Program Goals and Description
- III. Learning Outcomes and Assessment Results
- IV. Student Data
- V. Instructional Facilities
- VI. Institutional Support
- VII. Faculty Data

Most of these are self-explanatory and should be generated internally by the program/unit. The exception to this is the student admission and performance data listed in section IV, which is provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the program's self study. The two satisfaction surveys listed in sections IV. and VII. have been formulated by the CEP and will be conducted electronically through iEval and the Academic Senate Office. The program does need to provide a list of all program faculty including their full name, title, UCR net ID and email address. These data are needed to conduct the faculty surveys. Student contact information for the student satisfaction surveys will be provided by Computing and Communications.

Structure of the Program Self-Study: Please submit all of the program self-study documents, etc. in the following order:

I. Introduction and Contact Information

- Administrative structure of the program, starting with the Dean and including the substructure within the program. If applicable, units associated with student advising outside the program and committees and individuals within the program that play a major role in student affairs should be included.

II. Program Goals and Description

- Educational philosophy and vision. What do you want your students to learn and what skills do you want them to develop?
- Perceived strengths and weaknesses of program
- Recruitment and outreach plans
- Major changes in the program since the last review (if applicable)
- Any issue the program wants to bring up that would be helpful to the review committee

Separate addenda (to be included as an appendix):

- I&R Faculty FTE and faculty/student ratios
- Structure of degree(s) and specialty tracks
- All courses taught in past three years by Lecturers and Associates In
- Class sizes at the introductory and upper division levels
- Courses in your program taught by faculty from outside your program
- Courses in other programs to which your faculty contribute
- Program expenditures related to undergraduate education

III. Learning Outcomes and Assessment Results

- In 2013 the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) identified five desired learning outcome competencies. Where appropriate, the outcomes need to be addressed in terms of how they are assessed by the program and its majors.
- The learning outcomes are summarized in Attachment D. The report needs to focus on what you believe that your majors should know upon graduation, and what skills they should possess. The report can be tailored to reflect the strengths of the program. Results of a recent learning outcomes assessment may be useful here.

IV. Student Data

- Five-Year summaries as of Fall quarter of each academic year (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study)
- Job placement data for majors after graduation (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study)
- Financial support including extramural grants, academic and research fellowships, and financial aid
- Advising, mentoring and career development
- Undergraduate research or other scholarly activity with information on presentations and publications
- Selected data from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) results for majors (This information will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study).
- Undergraduate Satisfaction Survey (This information will be provided by CEP and only be made available to the external reviewers and CEP)

V. Instructional Facilities

- Classrooms
- Instructional laboratories
- Information resources such as library and computer resources
- Role of instructional technology in the classroom and teaching laboratory
- Statement of future needs/requirements

VI. Institutional Support

- Staff personnel allocations for the last three years. This should be limited to staff involved in the teaching mission of the program. (e.g., academic advisors, personnel associated with the operation of the teaching laboratories, etc.)
- TA allocations for the past three years
- Institutional services

VII. Faculty Data

- For each faculty member, include a summary with the following. (See the standardized form in Attachment C of this document for composition of the faculty summaries):
 - 1) Academic biographies including publication data
 - 2) Area(s) of specialty and their impact on the undergraduate degree programs

- 3) Grants that impact the undergraduate program including undergraduate research
- Three-year teaching load data for each faculty member
 - Program workload summary with discussion of major-related and service instruction for other programs
 - Distribution of faculty among sub disciplines for past 5 years and recruitment plans for the future
 - Teaching evaluations for all undergraduate courses for the previous two years. The evaluations will be made available to only the external reviewers and CEP. Instead of including the information in the self-study due to the size of the content, it will be provided separately to the reviewers at the time of their visit.
 - Faculty Satisfaction Survey (This information will be provided by CEP and made available to only the external reviewers and CEP.)

III. Composition of the Review Team

External review teams include at least one faculty member from a UC campus and at least one member from a peer institution. A letter containing wording similar or identical to the following is sent by the CEP Chair to the Chair of the program under review to request suggestions for the membership of the external review team:

“The general policy specifies that normally one of the external reviewers will be a faculty member at another UC campus, and the other two reviewers will come from UC peer institutions. It is strongly desired to have members on the external review team who are tenured and ladder rank faculty. Please provide a ranked list of at least 12 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other campuses of the UC system and the rest from UC peer institutions throughout the U.S. If appropriate for your program, please divide the list of names into sections corresponding to subdisciplines, so that reviewers can be selected to appropriately span the range of subdisciplines in your program.

The CEP requests that you do not focus exclusively on a candidate’s research record or institutional reputation when developing a list of reviewers. Other relevant traits should be given strong consideration as well. These include teaching, advising, and administrative experience in undergraduate programs, particularly programs that are similar to yours or that exhibit characteristics that your program desires to achieve in the near future.

The CEP also asks to be **assured in writing that the proposed external visitors can carry out a neutral review**. The committee is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty: (1) personal friendships; (2) visitor and UCR faculty member present in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) Recent (within past five years) cooperative teaching or research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these items applies to a visitor, the individual should be eliminated or the Chair of the CEP Review Subcommittee should be informed of the facts of the relationship.”

For each proposed external reviewer, the program should provide complete contact information and a link to each potential reviewer's curriculum vitae. Particular attention is directed to gathering as much information as possible about the experience and dedication of the nominees to undergraduate education. After the list of ranked potential reviewers has been submitted, the CEP then selects a final ranked list of review team candidates. The CEP Chair contacts the individuals and, upon their acceptance of the invitation to participate in the review, sends them an official appointment letter. The Senate Office coordinates the Review Team travel, travel expense reimbursement and honoraria payment.

The CEP Subcommittee formulates a 'standard' set of questions that the Extramural Team may (not "must") use to guide its deliberations; most of the questions are used for all programs, but some are program specific. The program is provided with the questions that are sent to the Extramural Team.

About thirty days prior to the scheduled visit, the information from the program self-study and a package of additional information (contents of the package follow below) are sent by the Senate Office to each member of the Extramural Team. An identical information package is provided to the members of the CEP Review Subcommittee. The program, College Dean, appropriate College Academic Associate/Divisional Deans for undergraduate education, VPDUE, and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost receive copies of the review material without the faculty and student satisfaction surveys for the purposes of student and faculty confidentiality.

The following items are included in packets sent to Extramural Team members along with the Program Self Study:

1. Tentative schedule
2. Link to current UCR General Catalog
3. Link to guidelines and questions for reviewers in CEP UPR Procedures

Approximately one week before the review, the CEP Analyst will distribute a final schedule to everyone on the original distribution list. The Chair of the CEP Subcommittee will discuss the schedule with the external review committee at their first meeting to see if they want any changes, and if possible, changes will be accommodated.

IV. Extramural Team Guidelines

The following guidelines are provided to the extramural team:

UCR is interested in your overall assessment of the teaching and research accomplishments and potential of the unit you are reviewing. The charge to the reviewer is to evaluate the educational programs as well as to make explicit comparison of the UCR program with comparable programs in other major universities. The Senate is most interested in your expertise in assessing the quality of the undergraduate instructional programs. Recommendations to increase resources may follow from this, but are not in themselves the primary responsibility of the reviewers.

It might be helpful to think of your review with the following questions in mind:

1. What is the overall quality of the program with respect to the following:
 - a. Faculty teaching for both majors and non-majors
 - b. Student satisfaction
 - c. Undergraduate research
 - d. Overall reputation
2. Is the undergraduate program coherent in the areas of teaching, counseling, mentoring, and introduction to research for its students? Is it adequate in scope and depth to insure education appropriate for the BA/BS?
3. Are the program goals and learning outcomes clear and explicit in regard to what students should be learning in the major?
4. Do the assessment results suggest that students are successfully attaining these outcomes?
5. Is there evidence that the program has reflected on these assessment results and engaged in curricular or other reforms in response to the results?
6. Would you want graduates of this program in your own graduate program?
7. Is the faculty quality and breadth of coverage adequate for a strong undergraduate program?
 - a. Areas that should (must) be strengthened or added?
 - b. Areas that should (must) be de-emphasized or removed?
 - c. Where should the next appointment (resources permitting) be made?
8. In many fields, long-range planning and strategic choices about areas of teaching and research are necessary. Does the program provide an imaginative, workable long-range plan that will allow it to make major contributions to the discipline and to pursue appropriate specializations with distinction? If not, what do you suggest?
9. Where should the program focus its efforts to improve itself? What would be needed for this program (or some component) to achieve true national distinction giving due consideration to present UCR faculty resources compared to those available at top ranked programs elsewhere?
10. Do students feel welcome in the major and is there adequate advising to meet their needs?

11. How do students and faculty feel about class size? How do they feel about the proportion of classes taught by TA's and lecturers/Associate Ins as opposed to regular faculty? How do students feel about grading standards and the response they get to written work for their classes?
12. Do the current administrative structures at UCR foster undergraduate education in the program you are reviewing? Are there closely related units at UCR or other UC campuses with which more collaboration should be undertaken? Are there appropriate support facilities such as libraries, teaching and research space, computer labs and training?
13. Is there sufficient interaction between the program and any campus programs with which it should interact?
14. Do students find it reasonable to complete the major on a four-year schedule?
15. Is the program doing enough to recruit quality students?
16. Is there any question we have not asked that you feel should be addressed?

We are aware that each program under review presents a special set of circumstances and that your review will need to take these distinctions into account. We intend these guidelines to be suggested topics that you may want to pursue rather than prescriptions of the process. As an External Reviewer, you should feel entirely free to pursue what avenues of investigation will yield constructive and relevant insights into the particular programs. We hope to obtain well thought-out and forthright judgments of where we stand in the academic picture, so that UCR may best capitalize on its strengths and take effective steps to correct weaknesses. The Academic Senate will give serious consideration to whatever directions you believe to be most worthwhile in achieving those ends.

Any questions concerning the review should be directed to the Subcommittee Chair and Senate staff analyst.

V. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

On the first morning of the site visit, the review team meets with the CEP Chair, VPDUE, and CEP Review Subcommittee. At this meeting, the CEP Chair and Subcommittee will give a briefing on procedures for the review and any other issues deemed necessary. The Review Team is asked to provide an assessment of the quality of faculty, students, and the program; areas of strength and weaknesses; advice on areas to remove or strengthen, adequacy of facilities, morale, and any other issues they wish to address. They are asked to furnish a written report of approximately 10-15 pages within two weeks of their visit. Following the morning meeting, the extramural review team meets with the Department/Program Chair followed by individual time with the faculty Undergraduate Advisor. After the initial briefings, the Review Team meets with the college Dean and appropriate Associate/Divisional Deans for student affairs. Lunch is provided to the Review Team in the Senate conference room with the Chairs or other interested faculty of departments of closely related programs or programs who teach prerequisites for the

program being reviewed. After the lunch, the program is responsible for setting up a tour of the facilities and meetings with the faculty of the program at the end of the first day and the beginning of the second day. The program can host a reception for the review team after the last meeting of the first day. To assure a neutral review, CEP requests that all program faculty and staff be invited. Additionally, CEP recommends that the program make every effort possible to invite a random and representative sample of students to the reception. The reception is to be held on campus so that it is accessible to all invitees. No formal dinners should be planned with UCR contacts on the first night of the review. The team should be allowed to dine together and discuss preliminary findings.

On the second day of the site visit, the program should schedule meetings between the Review Team and their staff advisors as well as the Career Center advisors applicable to the program. In addition, the program TA's, Lecturer's and lab staff (if applicable) should meet with the reviewers. A block of time should be allowed for selected students to meet with the reviewers. The lunch session on the second day is a closed session for the reviewers. The last on campus activity is the exit interview when the Extramural Review Team meets with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, VPDUE, the Dean, the Program Chair, the CEP Chair, and the CEP Subcommittee to give a discussion on their findings. The Chair of CEP chairs this exit interview.

When the Review Team report is received, the honoraria are sent to the reviewers.

SAMPLE REVIEW TEAM SCHEDULE

Day 1		
External review team arrives at UCR		
8:00–8:30 am	External review team only	Senate conf. room
8:30-9:15 am	CEP Chair, VPDUE, & Review Subcommittee	Senate conf. room
9:15-10:15 am	Program Chair	Senate conf. room
10:15–10:30 am	Break	
10:30-11:15 am	Faculty Undergraduate Advisor of Program	Senate conf. room
11:15 am–12:00 pm	Dean and Associate/Divisional Deans of the College or School	Senate conf. room
12:00–12:15 pm	Break	Senate conf. room
12:15-1:15 pm	Lunch with Chairs or designates and interested faculty of closely related programs, particularly those who teach prerequisite courses for program.	Senate conf. room
1:15–1:30 pm	CEP Subcommittee Member escorts reviewers to department for tour	
1:30-2:30 pm	Tour of Program's physical	

	facilities including laboratories, classrooms, library.	
2:30-4:00 pm	Faculty of the program	Suggested: small group visits lasting one half hour in Program's conference room
4:00-5:00 pm	Selected students in the program	
Optional Program Reception for External Reviewers		
External Reviewers Return to Hotel		

Day 2		
External Reviewers Arrive at UCR from Hotel		
8:30-9:00 am	Faculty of the program	Program conf. room
9:30-10:00 am	Selected students of the program	
10:00-10:45 am	Program staff advisors and Career Center	
10:45-11:30 am	TA's, Lecturers, and lab staff of the program	
11:30-11:45 am	Program escort reviewers to Academic Senate	
11:45 am -12:45 pm	Closed session lunch	Senate conf. room
12:45-2:15 pm	Faculty of the program	Program conf. room
2:15-2:45 pm	Program Chair	Program chair's office
2:45-3:00 pm	Break	
3:00-3:30 pm	Review Team only - Preparation of brief oral summary	Senate conf. room
3:30-4:15 pm	Exit Interview with Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, VPDUE, College Dean, CEP Chair, CEP Subcommittee	Senate conf. room
4:15-5:00 pm	External Review Team Wrap Up	Senate conf. room
Review Team departs Riverside		

SUBMISSION OF EXTERNAL REPORT: The External Review Team will submit their report to the CEP Chair within two weeks of their on-site visit. The External Review Team is advised that the report they submit will become a public record and as a result should be mindful with issues of confidentiality.

VI. Procedure on Findings and Recommendations

After the Review Team Report is received by the Chair of CEP, s/he shall distribute the report to the Subcommittee and the program Chair. The CEP Chair will ask the program to review the report for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions within a two-week time period. The program summary of any factual corrections and misperceptions will be relayed by the CEP Chair to the Subcommittee to aid in drafting the Findings and Recommendations.

The Subcommittee shall study the Team report and any factual corrections and misperceptions provided by the program and draft their Findings and Recommendations—a cohesive plan of action for improvement of the program. In developing their draft, the Subcommittee members shall integrate their understanding of the program with the new materials generated in the self-study and Team report. The Subcommittee will recommend possible changes, if any, to improve the quality of the undergraduate program under review. If the draft Findings and Recommendations appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Subcommittee and CEP Chair may meet with the Chair and/or Undergraduate Advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document if the CEP Subcommittee thinks it would be helpful. On some occasions, the Subcommittee and CEP Chairs will seek to meet with the College Dean and a limited number of faculty members to discuss the draft Findings and Recommendations. Where the Findings and Recommendations do not appear to be controversial, the Subcommittee and CEP Chairs do not usually meet with the program Chair or other representatives. Copies of the preliminary Findings and Recommendations will be distributed to all members of the CEP, who may endorse the draft, approve the draft contingent to minor changes, or refer the draft back to the Subcommittee.

The CEP Chair will send the preliminary Findings and Recommendations to the program Chair for distribution to the program faculty, staff and students no later than three weeks after receipt of the program’s “correction of facts” in the extramural report. The program shall seek and collect input from all constituents and prepare a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The program response is to be submitted to the CEP within two weeks of receiving the preliminary Findings and Recommendations.

The CEP review Subcommittee members will study the response from the program and within two weeks prepare the final Findings and Recommendations report. The Findings and Recommendations are a policy document, and failure by the program to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on undergraduate admissions or other actions. The CEP shall distribute its approved final report to the program for action along with copies of the External Review Team’s Report, program’s factual corrections to external report, preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report, and program’s response to the preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report and to the respective college Dean and appropriate Associate Deans, the Academic Senate-Riverside Division Chair, VPUE, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, and the Chancellor. Relevant portions of the report will be furnished to other Senate committees as needed. If any findings or recommendations fall substantially outside the purview of the program (e.g., resource issues such as faculty lines, staffing, or facilities) these will be identified in the report and written responses will be requested from the relevant campus units (e.g. Dean or Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost). At this point the action implementation phase begins.

ACTION/IMPLEMENTATION: After the review, the CEP Chair, CEP review Subcommittee members, the VPDUE, the college Dean and/or Associate/Divisional Dean shall meet with program representatives to discuss the action steps to be taken as a result of the review. A timeline is set and resources needed to accomplish the plan’s goals are identified and drafted in

an implementation plan by the CEP Chair and sent to the program within two weeks of the meeting.

COMPLIANCE WITH IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: The CEP shall review the implementation plans of programs reviewed in the previous year. If the program was successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, the review is closed. If not, the review remains open and CEP may recommend follow-up actions to the program and appropriate campus administrators.

NOTIFICATION OF REVIEW STATUS: Upon completion of the action implementation phase the CEP Chair will send a memo to the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, VPDUE, college Dean, appropriate Associate/Divisional Deans, and Academic Senate-Riverside Division Chair notifying them of the status of the review. The CEP Chair will inform the recipients that supporting documentation for the reviews will be on file and stored in the Offices of the Academic Senate-Riverside Division. A brief summary of the programs reviewed and CEP actions are included in the CEP Annual Report to the Academic Senate-Riverside Division.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Undergraduate Program reviews will be treated with confidentiality until they are closed. The first reason for this confidentiality is to protect the program under review by ensuring it has a chance to respond to the Reviewer's report and correct error of fact and potential misconceptions before the report circulates. The second reason is to protect faculty governance of academic programs by ensuring that reviews are carried out in an atmosphere free of undue pressure from on or off campus. It is not appropriate to discuss a review in progress with anyone not normally a part of the process. However CEP may, at its discretion and in consultation with the program under review, share final documents before a review is closed with relevant campus units that demonstrate a compelling rationale for viewing the documents (e.g. accreditation reporting by the Office of Evaluation and Assessment).

Attachment A

Undergraduate Program Review Student Satisfaction Survey

The undergraduate major in which you are enrolled is being reviewed by a team of faculty from other institutions and the Committee on Educational Policy. This survey is an essential part of the review process. Your feedback is important to help identify strengths and areas where improvement is needed for your major. Your responses will be confidential and no identifying information will be revealed.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact the Committee on Educational Policy Senate Analyst.

If the above major is not your major, please stop here!

Part A: Please answer each of the following questions.

1. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3 = 3 years)

2. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a college other than a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3 = 3 years; 4 = 4 or more years)

3. How many full years have you completed at UCR to date?

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3 = 3 years; 4 = 4 years; 5 = 5 or more years) (Edit)

4. How would you rate your overall level of satisfaction with your current major at UCR?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

5. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with your current rate of progress toward completion of the bachelor's degree?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

6. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with course availability within your major?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

7. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with course content within your major?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

8. How good a fit is your current major to your long-term career objectives?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

9. Have staff who have provided you with academic advising been courteous, helpful, and knowledgeable? Examples of staff advisors are people who work in departmental offices or advising centers.

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

10. Have faculty (i.e. professors or the Dean) who have provided you with academic advising been courteous, helpful, and knowledgeable?

(N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

11. What would be your level of enthusiasm in recommending your major to others? (N/A, 1=Rarely/Very Poor/Very Dissatisfied – 7=Always, Excellent/Very Satisfied)

Part B: Use the space below to answer the following questions regarding your current major.

12. What do you like best about your major? (Open Comment)

13. What about your major is in greatest need of improvement? (Open Comment)

Attachment B

Undergraduate Program Review Faculty Survey

As you know, the undergraduate program in which you participate is being reviewed by a team of faculty from other institutions and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). As a faculty member in this department, you are invited to participate in the Faculty Survey. This survey is an essential part of the review process and consists of questions related to the quality and curriculum of the department. At the end of the survey you are invited to summarize your views or to elaborate on any aspect of the program you feel warrants more attention. Your constructive feedback is useful to the external review team and CEP in assessing the program.

Please note that only the external review team and CEP will have access to these comments.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact the CEP Senate Analyst.

Thank you for your participation.

1. Please indicate if you are a:

Ladder rank Faculty member
Lecturer
Academic Coordinator

2. What is your view of the overall quality of this undergraduate program?

Excellent
Good to very good
Satisfactory
Marginal
Unsatisfactory

Comments:

3. What is your view of the quality of the curriculum for this program?

Excellent
Good to very good
Satisfactory
Marginal
Unsatisfactory

Comments:

4. How favorably would you compare the quality of this program to equivalent programs at comparable universities?

Better
Equivalent
Poor

Comments:

5. Do you feel that the curriculum for this major needs changes?

No changes needed
Minor changes needed
Significant changes needed (please specify)

Comments:

6. Do you feel that the curriculum for this program adequately covers the breadth of the discipline?

Very well
Fairly well
Poorly

Comments:

7. Do you feel that the curriculum for this program adequately covers the discipline in appropriate depth at the undergraduate level?

Very well
Fairly well
Poorly

Comments:

8. Do you feel that the level of course content in the courses designed for your majors is

Appropriate for the quality of the students
Too high
Too low

Comments:

9. The quality of undergraduate students in this major is generally

High

Satisfactory
Low

Comments:

10. Are courses required for the major offered frequently enough?

Yes
No

Comments:

11. Does the undergraduate major depend heavily on courses provided by other departments or programs?

Yes
No

12. If yes to the previous question, are those courses satisfactory in content and instruction?

Yes
No

13. Do faculty in other programs participate in teaching courses in this program?

Yes
No

14. If yes, do those faculty participate in decisions concerning the content and scheduling of those courses?

Yes
No

15. Do you feel that the quality of instruction is strong for the courses required for the major?

Very strong
Strong
Adequate
Poor

Comments:

16. Do you feel that the faculty members who teach in this major consider their teaching responsibilities as a high priority among their many responsibilities?

High priority
Moderate priority
Low priority
Poor

Comments:

17. Do you feel that faculty efforts in undergraduate instruction are sufficiently rewarded in the merit and promotion process?

Yes
No

Comments:

18. Do the majors have sufficient opportunities to be involved in enrichment experiences such as research?

All students who seek such opportunities
A reasonable fraction of students who seek such opportunities
A small fraction of students who seek such opportunities

Comments:

19. Are there good mechanisms in place to ensure that the majors are aware of enrichment opportunities such as research?

Yes
Outreach could be better
No

Comments:

20. Undergraduate instructional space and facilities are

Excellent
Good
Marginal
Poor

Comments:

21. Are students in the major advised properly?

Excellent
Satisfactory
Poor

Comments:

22. Who is primarily responsible for academic advising of the students in the major?

The Undergraduate Advisor
The Dean's office
Individual faculty
Staff

Comments:

23. What is the most frequent cause of student dropout from the major?

Dissatisfaction with the major
Incompetence of the student
Lack of opportunities in that discipline after graduation
Other:

Comments:

24. Does the Department/Program formally assist students in placements, either for job or professional programs?

Excellent placement program
Poor placement program
No placement program, but individual faculty assist students
No placement program

Comments:

25. How are the job prospects for students who graduate from the major?

Excellent
Very good
Good
Marginal
Poor

Comments:

26. My undergraduate instruction load is

About right
Too heavy
Too light

Comments:

27. Is the total number of faculty sufficient for maintaining a high quality major?

Yes
Marginal
No

Comments:

28. How do you evaluate faculty morale in your major with respect to the Department or Program, not with respect to the university?

Excellent
Good
Poor

Comments:

29. "Administrators are adequately supportive of this program." My perception of this statement is:

True
False

30. Comments summarizing your views of the program being evaluated, or elaborating in greater detail on any aspect of the program that you feel warrants particular attention.

Attachment C

Faculty Biography Summary Template Form

Please use the following template to provide a summary of each faculty’s biography for the Faculty Data section of the self-study. Please note that this template may be altered to suit the needs of each program, but should be limited to 2 to 3 pages and uniformly adopted for the whole program (i.e., all faculty members in a program under review should use exactly the same form).

Department of _____ (or Program in _____) Faculty
Information Summary

Name:

Position Title:

Year and Rank of Appointment at UCR:

Joint or Collaborating Appointments in Other Programs, Departments, or Centers:

Highest Degree Earned, Institution, Year Earned:

Postdoctoral Training:

Areas of Research Specialization:

Total Number of Peer-Reviewed Publications:

Five Most Important Peer-Reviewed Publications:

Selected Awards and Honors during the Past Ten Years:

Administrative Positions and Selected Major Committee/Service Work during the Past Ten Years, Including Dates of Service:

Undergraduate Courses Taught During the Past 3 Years:

Undergraduate Thesis Supervision During the Past 3 Years:

Grants that Impact the Undergraduate Program Including Undergraduate Research:

Title of Granting Agency	Total Award (Direct Cost)	Number of Undergraduate Students Supported Through this Grant (If Applicable)

Attachment D

WASC Core Competencies

In 2013 the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) defined a set of five core competencies that an institution is expected to demonstrate in terms of the assessment of student learning and achievement. These are:

- Written communication
- Quantitative reasoning
- Oral communication
- Information literacy
- Critical thinking

An extended definition of each of these can be found on the Evaluation and Assessment page of the UCR Undergraduate Education web pages which can be found at:

http://ueeval.ucr.edu/assessment/core_competencies_2.html

The annual learning assessment reports submitted by the program should already include descriptions of the metrics used by the program for its internal assessment and the results of their application. These may be used as a source for the material needed for the self-study.

Appendix A

Procedures for Internal Reviews of Undergraduate Programs

CEP may conduct internal reviews on programs to assess the progress of an undergraduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review, to evaluate the progress of new undergraduate programs, or to evaluate a small program with a small enrollment of students including minors that are not part of a program that offers a major. Internal reviews will be an abbreviated version of a routine external review that can be targeted to problematic issues.

1. CEP will inform the program of the decision to have an internal review and provide a reason for the internal review in the preceding academic year.
2. A CEP subcommittee will be formed to include at least two members to conduct the internal review.
3. The CEP subcommittee shall become familiar with the most recent previous review and outstanding issues. Members will read the previous external review reports. The subcommittee will also schedule a one-day review meeting and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted to the remaining issues or unique nature of the program that necessitated an internal review.

The following information may be collected and evaluated by the CEP Subcommittee prior to the review meeting (not all of these data may be necessary, depending on the circumstances and timing of the internal review):

- A statement concerning the program's vision (program self study report). This statement should include the program's strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies, progress from past reviews (if applicable), long range goals, and enrollment plans.
- Up to date biosketches for all program faculty.
- Program material that is distributed to students and structure of degrees.
- A brief statement outlining how undergraduate student advising is conducted.
- Results from faculty and student satisfaction surveys (CEP will conduct these surveys and hold the results confidential)
- Student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP.

After the evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair of the program to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to planning for the future. The subcommittee should also meet with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and College Dean. If the

subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional meetings with program faculty and/or students.

4. The Subcommittee is responsible for drafting a preliminary Findings and Recommendations report that will follow the same procedures as required for an external review report. The report should include the reason for the internal review. The remainder of the reporting process and action implementation process are to be followed as described in the procedures for external reviews.

APPENDIX 5

Procedures for Internal Reviews of Undergraduate Programs with ABET

Implementation of ABET-CEP Merger of BCOE Undergraduate Program Review Riverside Division of the Academic Senate (Revised 6/4/2014)

On March 16, 2011, CEP approved the merging of BCOE's ABET accreditation and CEP's undergraduate program review. The justification for this action is a desire to reduce the workload of the departments under review and CEP by substituting the ABET review for CEP's external review. After a comparison of the two review processes, CEP determined that ABET's review is very thorough even though there are differences in the review criteria and process. It was felt that these differences in principle are relatively minor and can be addressed internally by CEP's subcommittees tasked with conducting the reviews. To be relevant, CEP's reviews must be coordinated with the release of ABET's final report, which usually occurs in the summer following the site visit, and this raises a concern regarding CEP's workload associated with the desire to review all of BCOE's undergraduate programs in a short time frame. To accomplish this in a single year would far exceed CEP's normal workload, even though some aspects of the review process, such as the visit by a separate external review committee for each program, is no longer necessary. To manage the workload issue, CEP will spread the review process out over several (2-3 years) years following the release of ABET's final report, understanding that the programs being reviewed are dynamic, making the utilization of the ABET process more difficult for program reviews with the longest delays. The procedure for BCOE's undergraduate program review will be as follows:

1. After ABET releases its draft statement, which usually occurs before the end of the academic year, BCOE will forward a copy, along with the department's responses, to CEP, who will review these documents and determine which undergraduate programs will be evaluated the following year. CEP will usually schedule 2 or 3 programs for review, and one factor in setting the priority will be to review problematic programs early when ABET's recommendations are timely and intervention is most effective. CEP reserves the right to reject the ABET report for any program, and require a regular external review. This may occur for several reasons, such as in cases where there are serious concerns, where ABET failed to address an issue of importance to the CEP, or when too much time has elapsed between the ABET report and program review.
2. When ABET releases its final statement in the summer, BCOE will send it and any accompanying documents to CEP along with the program's self-study for the ABET review.
3. Early in the academic year, CEP will select subcommittees to conduct the reviews, and the programs under review will submit responses to the ABET report.
4. After the subcommittee has been selected faculty and student satisfaction surveys in accordance with CEP's Undergraduate Program Procedures will be completed through Computing and Communications. The results of these surveys will serve to supplement the ABET report and will be held confidential. Only the review subcommittee and CEP will have access to the results.
5. The subcommittee will review ABET's final report, the self-study and the program's

response to the ABET report. During the review, the subcommittee may amend the review if necessary. For example, an amendment could request additional information from the program or solicit a supplemental external evaluation.

6. Once the terms of the review and any amendments are completed, the subcommittee will prepare a draft Findings and Recommendations document. This document will be forwarded to the program by the end of the academic year, though in most cases it will be sent much earlier. From this point on, the review process is identical to that of a regular external review.
7. At the end of the first academic year of the review cycle, CEP will use ABET's final statement to determine which programs are reviewed the following year. As before, CEP reserves the right to reject the ABET report for any program and require a regular external review. The process is continued until all the programs are reviewed. Undergraduate programs that are not part of the ABET review process will undergo a regular external review at a time that is not necessarily tied to the ABET accreditation.

APPENDIX 6

TEMPLATES FOR WRITING *FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

Committee on Educational Policy Preliminary Findings and Recommendations (Program Name) Undergraduate Program Review

Background

Include several paragraphs summarizing the background of the program.

External Review Team Report Summary

Include several paragraphs that summarize the External Review Team Report and the conclusions and recommendations made by the external review team.

Program Response to External Review Team Report Summary

Summarize the program's response to the external review team report listing any misconceptions or factual errors in a brief statement.

Findings and Recommendations

Based on the External Review Team Report and the review itself draft a set of numbered findings and recommendations.

**Committee on Educational Policy
Final Findings and Recommendations
(Program Name) Undergraduate Program Review**

In a brief statement acknowledge the program's response to the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report and address any concerns from that were included.

Based on the programs response to the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report update the list of findings and recommendations and include the number list of the final findings and recommendations here.

The following information stays the same from the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report:

Background

Include several paragraphs summarizing the background of the program.

External Review Team Report Summary

Include several paragraphs that summarize the External Review Team Report and the conclusions and recommendations made by the external review team.

Program Response to External Review Team Report Summary

Summarize the program's response to the external review team report listing any misconceptions or factual errors in a brief statement.

Findings and Recommendations

Based on the External Review Team Report and the review itself draft a set of numbered findings and recommendations.

APPENDIX 7
Committee on Educational Policy
Guidelines for the Approval of Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs
(Updated 06/11/20)

A change in curriculum is initiated by the department or committee that sponsors the curriculum. The proposed change is considered first by the appropriate Executive Committee, and then by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). If both committees consider the change to be noncontroversial, the proposed change is placed on the Consent Calendar for a meeting of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

In addition to changes to academic program's curriculum, CEP requests that all proposed changes to a program's change of major requirements be submitted for review by CEP and documented in the Academic Catalog.

When composing proposed program changes the CEP requests that the following guidelines be followed:

1. The proposed program change should be formatted in a Word document with a two column format. The left column is labeled "Present" and includes the current catalog copy. The right column is labeled "Proposed" and includes the proposed new language. On the **present side**, the strikethrough function is used to cross out affected areas and on the **proposed side**, the underline function is used to note new wording. **Please see Attachment A for the format that each proposal should be in upon submission to CEP.**
2. When submitted to CEP, the proposed program change must be accompanied by the CEP coversheet for the approval of proposed program changes. The cover sheet can be downloaded from CEP's webpage (<http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=10>) and is included in Attachment 2 of this document.
3. Program and Executive Committee staff and faculty must take great care to proofread the proposed revisions, recalculate units, and provide a thorough justification for the changes. The justification must address the motivation for the change, the anticipated impact of the change on student participation in the program, and the resources required by the program. How the change will be implemented with respect to students already in the program should also be specified in the justification.
4. If the proposed changes include newly required courses from other programs, then a statement should be made in the justification that the other program's department has been consulted and has agreed to provide access to the courses.
5. All curriculum changes that include proposed changes to admission requirements are also routed to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions for review.
6. If a proposed change affects another department's program, that department must be consulted and all affected programs must submit the same proposal for changes to undergraduate requirements.

7. All proposals for changes in curriculum to become effective in Fall of the following year should be submitted to CEP as early in the academic year as possible and no later than the last week of February in order to allow sufficient time for review by CEP and the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions as needed. After CEP's approval the program changes are reported on the agenda for adoption at the next Division Meeting.

Attachment A – Format for Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs

Submissions of proposed changes to undergraduate programs must be received in the Academic Senate Office in the following format; any other format will be returned to the College Office and any delay could result in missing deadlines.

Do not submit the proposal in the form of a memo.

The document must be formatted as follows:

Margins: 1” top margin; 1” bottom and side margins

Font: Times New Roman, font size 11

➤ Do not use: fonts in colors other than black, text boxes, borders, page numbers, and dates/times in the footer/header.

1. Begin each item on a line by itself.
2. Capitals are used at the beginning of each line.
3. No semicolons are used at the ends of lines.
4. No periods are used at the end of lists.
5. All subject area abbreviations should be in all caps, i.e. HIST, BIOL
6. If a course is cross-listed, all cross-listings should be included and in alphabetical order (e.g. ETST 130/HIST 130/SOC 130)
7. Commas are used to separate course listings unless there are groups of courses, that is, series courses, which might need to be separated by semicolons.
8. On **Present** side, use the strike through function on all items being deleted – words or punctuation. On **Proposed** side, use the underline function for ALL additions/changes.
9. Departments must ensure that all courses they listed have been approved by the Committee on Courses.
10. If there is no change to a section of a major, departments must insert “[no change]” on the **Proposed** side for that section.
11. Departments should not include the section of the catalog copy describing the department and the major as the College Executive Committees and CEP does not approve this portion of the catalog copy.
12. In the approvals section of the document, the date of the approval of the faculty of the department, faculty of the College, and Executive Committee must be entered.

The following is the sample format for the document. A word template is found on CEP's webpage (<http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=10>) to assist departments in compiling the proposed changes:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF [insert name of college]
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
(insert date)

To be adopted:

Proposed Changes to [name of major/minor]

PRESENT:

- 1. Text
- 2. Text
 - a) ~~Text~~
 - b) Text
 - (1) Text
 - (2) Text
 - (a) Text
 - (b) Text

PROPOSED:

- 1. Text
- 2. Text
 - (a) Added/changed text
 - (b) Text
 - (1) [no change]
 - (2) Text
 - (a) [no change]
 - (b) Text

Justification:

Include justifications for **EVERY change/addition/deletion** that is made.

Approvals:

Approved by the faculty of the Department of _____: (insert date)
Approved by the faculty of the College of _____: (insert date)
Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of _____: (insert date)
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: (insert date)

Attachment 2 – Coversheet for Request for Approval of Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs

**Committee on Educational Policy
Coversheet for Request for Approval
Of Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs**

Program:	Click here to enter text.
Department:	Click here to enter text.
Affected Programs:	Click here to enter text.
Interdisciplinary Program: (if yes, please list other programs affected)	
Date:	Click here to enter text.
Proposed Effective Date:	Click here to enter text.

Faculty Contact:	Click here to enter text.	Email:	Click here to enter text.	Phone:	Click here to enter text.
Prepared by:	Click here to enter text.	Email:	Click here to enter text.	Phone:	Click here to enter text.

**Proposed Modification(s)
(please check all that apply)**

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Course requirements – **Course changes/new courses MUST be approved in CRAMS prior to program change submission.**
- Other (please describe):

The attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be included in the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be ~~stricken~~. A justification must be included for **EVERY change/addition/deletion** that is made.

The Committee on Educational Policy’s (CEP) Guidelines for Approval of Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Programs should be consulted for the proposal process and format of the document. In addition, a word template for proposed changes is available for departments to utilize. Both documents can be found on CEP’s webpage (<http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=10>).

APPENDIX 8

Committee on Educational Policy Process and Guidelines for Establishment of New Undergraduate Academic Programs

The Approval Process for New Undergraduate Academic Programs

The Universitywide Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (also known as the Compendium) states that "All actions involving undergraduate degree programs are carried out on the nine established campuses. That is, creating a new undergraduate degree program, changing the name of an existing undergraduate degree program, and consolidating, transferring, or discontinuing an existing undergraduate degree program are campus decisions and there is no Systemwide review of them. If approved by the responsible divisional Academic Senate committee and supported by the campus administration, a proposed action involving an undergraduate degree program is implemented." "The one action that would continue to require Systemwide review and approval is the creation of an undergraduate degree title unique to the campus (e.g., the first BFA program of any kind on the campus)."

Once the proposal has gone through the program faculty, College faculty (if necessary), and the College Executive Committee, it should be forwarded to the Senate Chair for review by the Committee on Educational Policy and other relevant Senate Committees. After review of the proposal, the document is sent to the Division for final approval. **See Attachment A for a flowchart of the review process.**

Adopted by the CEP 11/14/07, Rev. 02/20/08, Am. 10/20/10, Am. 11/07/14, Am. 04/03/15, Am. 05/26/17

Guidelines for Establishment of New Undergraduate Academic Programs

A proposal for a new academic program should include the following information:

1. Name of the academic program and the department(s) or unit(s) that will administer the program.
2. A thorough justification, including the motivation for the creation of the program in terms of student interest and professional or academic importance.
3. Relationship of the new program to existing programs.
4. The proposed curriculum. Great care should be given in this area, correct rubrics should be listed for courses, all cross listings should be listed, unit total considerations should be taken into account and totals should be verified by program staff, faculty, and appropriate Executive Committee personnel. A copy of the proposed program change should be provided for inclusion in the Catalog.
5. A list of faculty who will be involved in the program, including those teaching, advising, and administering.

6. For interdisciplinary programs, the degree of participation and the role of each department must be explicitly described. The chairs of all participating departments must provide written approval for the creation of the program and indicate their commitment to provide necessary resources including faculty release.
7. Projected enrollment in the program.
8. Name of degree, if applicable, and the anticipated number of degrees to be granted when the program reaches steady state.
9. Potential impact of the new program on existing programs. If the proposed program includes required courses from a department other than the administering department, the proposal must include a statement from the department indicating that it has been consulted and that it will provide access to the required courses.
10. A full listing of resources required for start-up and for operations. In cases where no additional resources will be needed, this must be explicitly stated. This listing may include: personnel (faculty FTE or temporary positions, Teaching Assistants or Readers, administrative staff, technical support); support services including computer facilities and library resources; space requirements. A plan indicating how the resources will be obtained would also be helpful to the committee in reviewing the proposal. A letter of support from the College Dean and/or Executive Vice Chancellor-Provost indicating endorsement as well as a promise of support for the proposal also would be extremely helpful.
11. Both internal and external letters of support should be provided with the proposal. Internal letters of support are often from UCR department chairs and faculty of related programs. The external letters should be from other UC campuses or other peer institutions. Letters from off-campus help to establish the quality of the program and its fit within the context of related programs at other universities. Upon consultation with the CEP the demand for external letters may be waived.
12. Approvals from program faculty, College faculty (if the new proposal affects a college regulation), and the appropriate Executive Committee should be obtained before forwarding the new program to the attention of the Senate Analyst for CEP.
13. All proposals for new programs should be submitted to the Senate Chair no later than March 1 of the academic year prior to the fall quarter in which the proposed program is anticipated to go into effect. This schedule should provide sufficient time for Senate review of the proposal to meet the deadline for final consideration of approval at the May Division Meeting.

APPENDIX 9

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION NOVEMBER 26, 2013

To be reported:

Priority Enrollment Policy Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

In the past, certain groups of students have been granted and continue to maintain priority registration for classes. The purpose of this policy is to clarify three aspects of this issue: identify which body has final authority in deciding who gets priority enrollment, establish the criterion by which priority enrollment is decided and to describe the procedure that an interested party would follow in requesting priority enrollment. This policy only applies to the Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters. The policy for summer secession is determined by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE), who has responsibility for that operation, or his/her designate because it uses a different enrollment model (first-come first serve, pay-as-you-go) and caters to a different type of student population. We would encourage the VPUE to solicit advice on this matter from the Summer Session Steering Committee.

Since the educational process is the Academic Senate's primary responsibility and this process can be affected by priority enrollment, the Academic Senates must have final authority in deciding which groups are granted this privilege. Because of its role in educational matters, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is tasked with this responsibility.

Since requests for priority enrollment have been rare in the past and often have unique circumstances, each request will be decided on a case-by-case base. However, in making its decision, CEP will consider the following three criteria.

1. Federal or state mandates that require accommodations and provisions.
2. Special circumstances that require significant blocks of time for other programs involving institutional representation that may interfere with class schedules.
3. Recruitment incentives that assist the university in attracting and retaining top students.

These criteria are based on past practices and what has been adopted at other campuses. It should be noted that a key factor in the decision is the principle of equal and fair access for all. As a consequence, the bar for granting priority enrollment to a specific group is set high, and it is the responsibility of the interested party to provide strong and a well-documented justification with their request.

There may be individual cases where special circumstances dictate a need for priority enrollment. For example, a significant medical or financial hardship could be mitigated with more flexibility in the course schedule. These cases will be decided by the Associate Dean for Student Affairs in the college/school of the affected student because a quick response is often required and a single individual, not a group, is involved. The period where priority enrollment is granted to an individual will be strictly limited to a time during which the circumstance is in effect.

The procedure for requesting priority enrollment is as follows. A written request will be submitted to the Registrars' office with complete documentation for the justification. The VCSA or his/her designate will review the request along with the Associate Deans for Student Affairs in each College or School, and provide a response. After this review, the request, along with the VCSA's response, will be sent to CEP for a final determination.

.....
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy:
Approved by the Office of the Vice Provost for
Undergraduate Education:

May 23, 2013

May 23, 2013

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the
Wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic
Senate:

June 14, 2013

Received by Executive Council:

October 21, 2013