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

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 for Undergraduate Education (VPUE). 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.

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 4
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 proceeding 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 5 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 Academic
Senate Office.

The self-evaluation document contains the following <u>required </u>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. These data can be obtained through the office of the Vice Provost for

Undergraduate Education (VPUE) who will work with the program and CEP on their preparation. The two satisfaction surveys listed in sections IV. and VII. have been formulated by the CEP and will be conducted electronically through iEval . 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
- List specific learning outcomes for Program major(s). What should your majors know upon graduation, and what skills should they possess?
- Measures used to assess whether these outcomes were attained. (For example: capstone course, portfolio, exit exam, survey of majors).
- Results of recent assessment and examples of curricular or other reforms that have followed from this assessment.

IV. Student Data

- 5 Year summaries as of Fall quarter of each academic year (Provided by the VPUE)
- 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
- Undergraduate Satisfaction Survey (This information will be provided by CEP and only 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

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 Deans for undergraduate education, VPUE, 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 in a cover letter signed by the Subcommittee Chair:

1. Tentative schedule and campus map

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?

5. 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?

6. 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?

7. Do students feel welcome in the major and is there adequate advising to meet their needs?

8. 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?

9. 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?

10. Is there sufficient interaction between the program and any campus programs with which it should interact?

11. Do students find it reasonable to complete the major on a four-year schedule?

12. Is the program doing enough to recruit quality students?

13. 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, VPUE, 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 Deans for the discipline and 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. 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, VPUE, the Dean, the Program Chair, the CEP Chair, the 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 – CEP Subcommittee member to transport reviewers from Hyatt to UCR		
8:00–8:30 am	External review team only	Senate conf. room
8:30-9:15 am	CEP Chair, VPUE, & 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 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	
External Reviewers Return to Hyatt – Program to transport reviewers		
Optional Program Reception for External Reviewers		

Day 2		
External Reviewers Arrive at UCR from Hotel – Program to transport reviewers		
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, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, 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 – CEP Subcommittee member to transport reviewers back to Hyatt		

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 Chairs usually meet with the Chair and/or Undergraduate Advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document. 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 3 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 2 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: In the Fall Quarter of the year after the review, the CEP Chair, CEP review Subcommittee members, the VPUE, the college Dean and/or Associate 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: Each Spring Quarter 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, VPUE, college Dean, appropriate Associate 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

<div align="center">

Undergraduate Program Review
Faculty Survey

</div>

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 fee 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 teamand 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

<u>**Faculty Biography Summary Template Form**</u>

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)