

**GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW
GUIDELINES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
GRADUATE COUNCIL**

Revised May 2016

Contents

Chapter 1: Program Review Information	5
1.1 Graduate Program Reviews.....	5
1.2 Guidelines for Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs	6
1.3 Master’s-Only Graduate Programs.....	8
1.4 Self-Supporting Degree Programs (SSDPs)	9
Chapter 2: Guidelines for the Review Team	11
2.1 Basis of the Review	11
2.2 Meetings	11
2.3 Review Questions	11
2.3.1 Program Standing and Value.....	11
2.3.2 Student Education.....	11
2.3.3 Course Curriculum	12
2.3.4 Student Financial Support	12
2.3.5 Faculty.....	12
2.3.6 Resources and Infrastructure.....	13
2.3.8 Diversity	13
2.3.9 Overall Assessment	14
Chapter 3: Program Review Stages	15
Stage I: Notification of Review	15
Stage II: Orientation Meeting.....	15
Stage III: Self-Review Preparation	15
Stage IV: Review Team Nomination and Recruitment	15
Stage V: Confidential Questionnaires	16
Stage VI: Submission of Self-Review Documents	17
Stage VII: Review of Program	17
Stage VIII: Reports.....	17

Stage IX: Follow-up Phase	18
Stage X: Finalizing the Date of the Next Review.....	19
Chapter 4: Self-Review Document: Executive Summary Section	20
Section 1: Mission Statement.....	20
Section 2: History of the Program.....	20
Section 3: Standing in the Field	21
Section 4: Strategic Plan.....	21
Section 5: Research	21
Section 6: Faculty	22
Section 7: Students	22
Section 8: Courses and Curriculum	23
Section 9: Diversity.....	23
Section 10: Alumni	24
Section 11: Status Report.....	24
Chapter 5: Self-Review Document: Data Section	25
5.1 Documents from the Previous Program Review	25
5.2 Program Administration	25
5.2.1 Administrative Profile	25
5.2.2 Faculty Membership List	26
5.2.3 Bylaws	26
5.3 Student Information	27
5.3.1 Current Graduate Students (provided by OGS)	27
5.3.2 Summary Data (provided by OGS)	27
5.3.3 Application and Admission Data (provided by OGS)	27
5.3.4 Enrollment Data (provided by OGS)	27
5.3.5 Graduation Data (provided by OGS).....	27

5.3.6 Student Financial Support (provided by OGS)	27
5.3.7 Alumni (as available, provided by the program)	27
5.4 Admitting and Mentoring Students	28
5.4.1 Mentoring Guidelines	28
5.4.2 Degree Requirements	28
5.4.3 Courses Taught.....	29
5.4.4 Graduate Student Handbook	29
5.4.5 Guidance Procedures	30
5.4.6 Teaching Assistant Training Program	30
5.4.7 GSR Compensation Plan.....	30
5.4.8 Recruitment Materials	31
5.5 Faculty Information.....	31
5.5.1 Abbreviated CVs.....	31
5.5.2 Memoranda of Understanding.....	31
Chapter 6: Format of Self-Review Documents	32
6.1 Presentation.....	32
Appendix A: University of California Diversity Statement	33
Appendix B: Sample E-mail to Faculty	34

Chapter 1: Program Review Information

1.1 Graduate Program Reviews

It is the mandate of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate to conduct regular reviews of current graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness. The purpose of a review is to promote excellence in graduate education; reviews are also an opportunity for graduate programs to evaluate past achievements, current status, and to plan for the future.

Approximately 12-16 programs are reviewed each year, with the expectation that each graduate program will be reviewed every 7-8 years. Occasionally, a program may be reviewed more frequently by administrative request or when there are problems that require Graduate Council's consideration. When an opportunity for improvement is identified, the review will give guidance to the program and to administrators about how such opportunities may be pursued. When programs are inadequate, the review will suggest concrete steps to rectify weaknesses and to achieve an acceptable standard. In some cases, Graduate Council may recommend a suspension of admissions that could lead to the closure of the graduate program. For those programs that are healthy, the review process will endorse the program's operation and direction.

The Program Review Committee (PRC), a standing committee of the Graduate Council, conducts the Graduate Program Review. The PRC consists of Academic Senate and Federation members, a graduate student representative, and ex-officio members from the Graduate Deans office. Members of the PRC will discuss the findings of the onsite review team and draft the PRC report to guide the discussions by Graduate Council. The Program Review Closure Committee conducts the follow-up phase of the review, and makes a recommendation to the Graduate Council regarding closing the review process for each program.

For each graduate program review, a review team is recruited that is composed of an ad hoc committee of campus faculty (for Master's and Ph.D. programs) and an external reviewer (for Ph.D. and M.F.A.-granting programs only). The review team is selected from nominations generated with input from the program chair and faculty, relevant deans, and PRC members. The ad hoc committee consists of UCD faculty members, who are not members of the graduate program under review. External reviewers are selected from nominations of prominent members of the appropriate fields who are outside UC Davis.

Designated Emphases (DE's) and Graduate Academic Certificate programs (GAC's) reviews are conducted by one campus faculty member, and have no external reviewer. DE and GAC reviews will only hold on-site meetings if deemed necessary.

The graduate review process requires documentation and self-evaluation, including:

- The program's self review (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)
- Confidential questionnaires completed by the graduate program's faculty and students
- A two-day meeting by the review team with the faculty and students of the program (except for DE's and GAC's)

- Reports from the review team (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)
- The program's corrections of fact to the review team reports (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)
- The PRC report and the Graduate Council letter of transmittal (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)
- Responses from the program and administrators to the PRC report and the Graduate Council letter of transmittal (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)
- The Program Review Closure Committee's assessment of the responses, and their recommendation to Graduate Council for closure of the review or further action. The process concludes with a vote by the Graduate Council (to be shared with the entire membership of the program)

1.2 Guidelines for Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs

*Approved by the Graduate Council on June 30, 1995; revised and approved November 30, 2001; revised and approved May 15, 2008.*¹

Rationale: At UCD, the development and evaluation of undergraduate and graduate academic programs is the responsibility of the faculty. In order to maintain the quality of graduate education, the faculty, through the Graduate Council, bears a responsibility to engage in the process of renewal of academic programs. The process of establishing, disestablishing, and regulating graduate programs at the Master's and Ph.D. levels is the ongoing responsibility of the Council. The Graduate Council will use the following set of guidelines in evaluating graduate programs at UC Davis.

Guidelines: It is the Graduate Council's responsibility to evaluate the academic components of graduate programs and to identify those that define the distinctive character of UC Davis as a research university. In collaboration with the Administration, those that define the academic character of UC Davis should be supported and managed in such a manner as to optimize graduate education and research across the campus. Criteria to be considered in identifying and prioritizing graduate programs that contribute to the quality of the campus include:

- The quality of the curriculum, faculty, and students;
- The record of achievement of the program;
- The place of the program in the field as a whole;
- The anticipated future of the program and the discipline;
- The contribution and centrality of the program to the missions and goals of the campus and the state;
- The contribution of the program to other fields of study at UC Davis at the graduate and upper division undergraduate levels; and
- The FTE, financial, and facilities resources required to develop or maintain the strength of the program.

¹ [Guidelines for Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs](#)

As scholarship is dynamic, it is expected that new graduate programs will be proposed by the faculty. The criteria for evaluating newly proposed programs differ from those used in evaluating existing programs, in that a new program would not have a record of accomplishment. The criteria for master's- only programs appropriate to a research university were approved previously and are appended to this document.

Standards and Measures: *Academic quality* – The paramount criterion on which all academic programs are to be judged must be quality, which is the excellence of achievements. This includes quality of the faculty, entering students, graduates, and the overall quality of the academic experience as perceived by those associated with the program and by external evaluators. The quality of graduate programs must be judged in a manner that is independent of the final degree objectives of the students. In assessing the quality of graduate programs, the following will apply:

1. *Programs* – Quality in a graduate program refers to the degree to which a program has:
 - A clear statement of its missions and goals;
 - A curriculum that is appropriate to the mission and reflects current thinking in the discipline or field;
 - Consistently good teaching in courses; and
 - Good faculty mentoring of graduate students.
2. *Faculty* – Quality with regard to faculty refers to the degree to which faculty are:
 - Actively engaged in significant research or other relevant creative endeavors;
 - Making a contribution to their discipline or field;
 - Good teachers; and
 - Good mentors for graduate students.
3. *Students* – Quality with regard to students refers to the degree to which students are:
 - Highly qualified for admission into a program;
 - Producing excellent research or creative work in projects, theses, or dissertations, and, if relevant, publications; and
 - Successfully compete for appropriate placements after graduation (employment, admission to further graduate education, post-doctoral appointments).
4. *The place of programs in the field as a whole* – Assessing the place of a program in the field as a whole refers to internal and external recognition of:
 - Outstanding faculty achievements in research;
 - Effective teaching programs;
 - Successful students;
 - Public service relevant to disciplinary potential; and
 - Scholarship at the frontier of inquiry.
5. *The future of the program and discipline* – Assessing the future of the program and discipline refers to an assessment of the degree to which a program:

- Reflects academic vitality and is engaged with distinctive or emerging intellectual directions;
 - Recognizes and adopts new trends in graduate education; and
 - Provides an education that will allow graduates to pursue current and future employment opportunities.
6. *The record of achievement of programs* – The record of achievement of existing programs refers to the degree to which a program is successful in:
- Recruiting highly qualified students to the graduate program;
 - Honoring the University’s goals of diversity in its student cohorts;²
 - Retaining and supporting its graduate students;
 - Providing the facilities necessary for student research;
 - Facilitating/ensuring the students’ completion of their degrees in a timely fashion; and
 - Placing its students in appropriate positions after graduation.

Priorities: These guidelines will be used by the Council through the Program Review subcommittee and review teams in reviewing existing programs and by the Educational Policy subcommittee in establishing new programs. The Council will use these measures in recommendations of establishment, continuation, or disestablishment of individual programs. The degree to which programs demonstrate success in meeting these guidelines will be used to recommend resource allocations (e.g., faculty FTE, program fellowships (formerly block grant funds), graduate student admission quotas) and to determine the viability of programs within the broad context of graduate education on the campus.

1.3 Master’s-Only Graduate Programs

Approved by Graduate Council on June 15, 1994.

The Graduate Council of the University of California, Davis recognizes that the University fulfills a unique role within the framework of the Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of California as the sole public institution empowered to grant doctoral degrees. Nevertheless, there are circumstances under which it is appropriate to establish academic programs in which the master’s is the only advanced degree offered. In general, such programs will reflect the distinctive qualities of a graduate program set within the context of a research university in order to provide opportunities for advanced education and training. Such programs commonly will be guided by a strong element of applying the results of research through service and outreach to the people of the State of California. In seeking to establish master’s- only graduate programs or evaluating their continuing effectiveness, the following criteria shall provide guidance:

1. **Academic Quality:** The paramount criterion on which all academic programs are to be judged must be quality, including quality of faculty, entering students, graduates, and the overall quality of the academic experience as perceived by those associated with the program and by external

² University of California Diversity Statement, adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate May 10, 2006; endorsed by the President of the University of California June 20, 2006.

evaluators. The quality of graduate programs must be judged in a manner that is independent of the final degree objectives of the students.

2. **Distinctiveness:** Master's-only graduate programs must demonstrate their distinctive contributions to the mission of the campus and to the people of the State of California. In particular, such programs must clearly identify a characteristic set of educational objectives and the manner in which they are able to reach their goals.
3. **Culture:** Master's-only graduate programs at the University of California can only thrive if they benefit from and contribute to the atmosphere of a research university. Such a culture is based on an emphasis on research, a critical mass of faculty engaged in an intellectual discipline, and a viable group of peers and mentors with whom to exchange ideas and interact regularly.
4. **Appropriateness:** Master's-only degree programs are normally appropriate if there is a demonstrated need for graduates who have been educated in a research-oriented atmosphere and where the master's degree is customarily viewed as the terminal advanced degree for practicing a particular profession. Further, it is expected that UC Davis graduates will be prepared to hold leadership positions in their fields. Finally, the faculty bears a responsibility to consider the appropriateness of a terminal master's degree program. The program must demonstrate that its requirements of students are commensurate with a master's degree rather than a doctoral degree.

1.4 Self-Supporting Degree Programs (SSDPs)

In addition to the regular program review criteria outlined in this guide, self-supporting degree programs have additional criteria that must be addressed during the program review according to campus policy. The review team for a SSDP should be aware of the campus and UCOP policies regarding SSDPs (see links below).

Specifically, SSDP program reviews must include an evaluation of the following:

- Whether the program performance/quality metrics are on par with state-supported graduate programs. (student quality, appropriate faculty/instructors, appropriate proportion of regular to non-regular faculty, etc.)
- The experience of students as they progress through the program. Do the students have a clear understanding of what campus services are available to them and which are not? Are the services sufficient? Is there a delegation of authority from Graduate Studies allowing the program or lead dean to handle student admissions and progress, and if so, are there any concerns about the program/college continuing with this delegation? Are students receiving adequate training for their degree objective (research/practical)?
- Review of MOUs. SSDPs must have a number of MOUs in place: are they current? Are they utilized? Are they sufficient in providing a stable and consistent environment for the program to succeed and meet campus expectations? MOUs include: (1) Lead Dean MOU, (2) Administrative partner(s) MOU, (3) Course reciprocation MOU (with a state-supported instructional unit), and (4) Surplus Revenue MOU. (See GS2014-01, section I.I., III.D. and IV.E.)

- Review of the Teaching Compensation Plan. Is it appropriate and is it employed consistently? (See GS2014-01, section II.A.)
- Whether the SSDP has detracted from related state-supported graduate programs. Is there a competition for students and faculty, and if so, is the state-supported program negatively impacted?
- Whether the courses of the SSDP have gone through the regular approval process, are taught regularly, are taught by appropriate instructors.
- Whether the fees charged are appropriate considering expected income level of employment after degree. Whether the fees are at a level that will continue to sustain the program. The review team will be provided with a budget review/audit from the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Budget and Institutional Analysis to inform the review.

Please refer to the [Policy for Self-Supporting Degree Programs](#) (GS2014-01) available on the Graduate Studies website: <https://gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/graduate-programs/policies>. In addition, please review UC Davis [PPM 200-26](#) and the UCOP Policy on Self-Supporting Degree Programs available on their website: <http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/content-analysis/academic-planning/self-supporting-programs.html>.

Chapter 2: Guidelines for the Review Team

2.1 Basis of the Review

The review will be based on guidelines established by Graduate Council and noted in the Guidelines Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs in Section 1.2, guidelines for Master's-only Graduate Programs in Section 1.3, and guidelines for Self-Supporting Degree Programs in Section 1.4.

2.2 Meetings

The graduate program review teams will meet with the program's faculty (including the Chair, graduate advisers, and the executive committee), graduate students, staff and relevant deans. The PRC expects a minimum of 75% of the faculty and students to participate in the review meetings. *DE and GAC reviews will only hold meetings if deemed necessary.*

2.3 Review Questions

The review team may address any questions they deem appropriate. The following questions are provided to the review team as a guide and to assist the program members in their preparation for their review. Of the suggested questions, certainly only those should be addressed that are relevant to the program.

2.3.1 Program Standing and Value

1. What is the need for graduates from this program on a statewide and national basis?
2. What is the standing of the program nationally and within the UC system?
3. What sources of information can you use for this assessment?
4. What other similar programs are available/comparable nationally?
5. Given the other comparable programs available, what are the unique aspects of the program at UCD?

2.3.2 Student Education

1. What is the state of the student morale?
2. Are students admitted to the program of the quality consistent with other graduate programs at UCD?
3. Are procedures in place for the program to recruit individuals from unrepresented minority groups (not including international students), and how can these be improved upon to increase diversity?
4. Are the mechanisms in place for following/monitoring the progress of PhD students after the qualifying exams adequate?
5. Are students publishing in well-respected journals in the discipline?
6. Is there adequate space available to students for their research or projects?

7. Is the necessary equipment available to students, and is it up-to-date and easily accessible?
8. Are there any safety issues related to facilities or procedures?
9. Is there sufficient information about alumni that provide an indication of the quality of graduate training in the program? If so, are alumni in the program actively engaged in the field in which they are trained? If not, what are the reasons for this, and do they reflect on the quality of training received?

2.3.3 Course Curriculum

1. Does the program offer coursework and research opportunities that are key to the professional development of students in the discipline?
2. Does the program depend upon other programs/departments for key aspects of student training? If so, is there a MOU between the parties agreeing to the necessary resource sharing?
3. Are there one or more required courses, which serve the need for breadth in the field?
4. Is there appropriate advanced coursework in specialized areas? Do the specialized areas adequately cover the field as a whole? Are they offered on a regular basis?

2.3.4 Student Financial Support

1. Does the program provide sufficient financial support for its students?
2. In those fields where extramural support is available through training grants, are these available to support students?
3. Are graduate students expected to apply for individual fellowships, if such funding is available? If so, how many are successful?
4. Is there an overreliance on TA support for students (particularly for those who have advanced to candidacy)?

2.3.5 Faculty

1. How is faculty morale in the program?
2. Does the program have critical mass of faculty necessary to provide adequate training in the field? Are the areas of emphasis listed in the graduate program covered adequately by the existing faculty?
3. Does the program actively review the membership and have faculty been removed from the program if they are not participating? Is recruitment of new members proactive?
4. Are there subdisciplines not currently covered in the research or teaching in the program that are key to the future success of the program? If so, does the program have specific and realistic plans for moving into those emerging areas with the current faculty?

5. In fields where the faculty typically publish with students, are faculty actively publishing with students in the program?
6. What percentage of the program faculty are engaged in teaching within the program?

2.3.6 Resources and Infrastructure

1. What percentage of the faculty actively participate on administrative committees of the program (Admissions, Executive, Guidance, Educational Policy, etc.)?
2. Comment on the leadership during the review period and on the leadership potential within the program.
3. How are program fellowships (formerly block grant funding) allocated?
4. Are the prerequisites for admission appropriate and evenly applied to all applicants? If students lack one or more prerequisite courses, how is this handled by the program?
5. Does the administrative structure of the program lend itself to program improvement, influx of new ideas, and involvement of all faculty?
6. Are the bylaws and degree requirements up-to-date and approved by Graduate Council? Are there any changes to recommend?
7. Is the program website up-to-date and useful?
8. Is there a graduate student handbook/survival guide? Is it helpful to students?
9. For reviews of graduate groups specifically: Are the chairs of the contributing departments committed to the graduate group? When department chairs hire faculty, is graduate teaching within the graduate group factored into the hiring decision?
10. What is the strategic plan of the program for the next decade? What are the emerging areas in the discipline and how does the group envision addressing education in these areas? What new opportunities does the group see that could benefit the program or students?

2.3.8 Diversity

Graduate reviews play an important role in implementing changes to address the challenges of diversity. PRC requests that the review team comment specifically on diversity within the following context: *“absent discrimination, we believe the demographic profile of UC students generally will reflect the gender, racial and ethnic profile of the pools from which UC recruits and selects students. UC participation rates should reflect the demography of these pools. This aspiration stems from our belief in the necessity of educational opportunity and achievement for all.”*³

³ <http://www.ucop.edu/graduate-studies/files/grad-prof-work-team.pdf>, page iv

Please obtain answers to the following questions:

- What is the strategy for recruiting a diverse pool of applicants?
- Are the faculty committed to the academic success of all students and sensitive to the special challenges faced by underrepresented and first generation graduate students?
- What is the evidence of culture of commitment to supporting a diverse graduate student population?
- Is there quantitative documentation of success in achieving diversity in applications, admissions, enrollment and completion?

2.3.9 Overall Assessment

1. What is your overall impression of the program?
2. Are faculty working together to provide a robust, nationally recognized program?
3. Were weaknesses identified in the last program review addressed adequately? How has this impacted the program?
4. Summarize the overall strengths.
5. Summarize the overall weaknesses.
6. Rate the quality of the current program relative to its quality at the time of the last review.
7. Rate the overall quality of the program relative to similar programs in the US.
8. In addition for Self-Supporting Degree Programs, please assess whether the program fees are sufficient to support the program, and also if the program has detracted from related state-supported graduate programs.

Chapter 3: Program Review Stages

Stage I: Notification of Review

In the late spring or summer, Graduate Council will initiate the reviews of graduate programs for the subsequent academic year.

The program chair is responsible for the self-review of the graduate program and will be considered by PRC as the main contact person for the review. In order for the self-review document to be completed on schedule, PRC encourages the chair to establish an ad hoc committee of faculty and staff from the graduate program to assist in preparing the self-review document.

It is emphasized that while staff may be responsible for gathering data for the review, it is the responsibility of the faculty to write a self-review, including the Executive Summary.

Stage II: Orientation Meeting

In fall, the PRC will host an orientation meeting with the chairs and staff of the graduate programs, DEs and GACs to be reviewed. The purpose of the meeting will be to answer questions regarding the self-review process and the self-review document. After the meeting, the chairs should notify the program's faculty and students of the review, and explain the importance of participating in the preparation of the self-review document, the confidential questionnaires, and the review meetings. Note the Program Review Web page describes the review process: <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/prc/>.

Stage III: Self-Review Preparation

The process for preparing the self-review includes three steps:

1. Gathering and compiling the data for the program review. Note that Graduate Studies provides some of the data that are required for the review (data sections 5.1 and 5.3).
2. Faculty review of the program's bylaws, degree requirements, faculty membership, mentoring guidelines, student's handbook, and the program's Web site.
3. Faculty prepare the self-assessment based on their analysis of the data.

Stage IV: Review Team Nomination and Recruitment

In fall, letters requesting nominations for the review team members will be e-mailed to the graduate program chairs, staff, and relevant deans (the chair and deans will submit separate lists). For graduate programs, the Review Team will consist of a three-member ad hoc committee from campus; and additionally, for Ph.D. and M.F.A. granting programs, an external reviewer. For DEs and GACs, the Review Team consists of one faculty member appointed by the PRC (**no nominations are required**).

Graduate programs must not contact the faculty they are nominating. The nominations for the review team should consist of:

1. A list of ten or more members of the campus faculty from outside the program to serve on the ad hoc committee; and
2. A list of three to five individuals who would be best suited to serve as the external reviewer to provide an independent assessment of the doctoral program.

The lists of names should be in rank order and should include the nominee's campus department or campus mail address, phone number and e-mail address and a brief statement detailing the important or unique qualifications of each nominee regarding their potential service as a reviewer of the graduate program, and a statement confirming the lack of an existing potential conflict of interest.

The list should be prepared in accordance with the conflict of interest policy below. It will be the responsibility of the program to notify PRC of all conflicts of interest. Based on the information received, PRC could decide that the conflict of interest is minor and does not present a concern for the nominee's service on the review team. However, even in such a case, all parties will be informed of any associations that have been raised as a potential concern. The request of nominations from the Deans includes instructions to supply their potential names to the program before submission to PRC, so that the program can identify any conflicts of interest. The PRC will recruit the review team from a final list of nominees provided by the graduate program, the relevant deans, and the PRC members.

Conflict of Interest Policy: The chair is expected to consult with the program's faculty regarding the individuals to be nominated and ensure that there is no potential or perceived conflict of interest for any of the nominees, in accordance with the Conflict of Interest Policy below.

In the case of a perceived conflict of interest, nominees may still be submitted along with an explanation of the potential conflict. The PRC will review the information and make a determination whether a meaningful conflict of interest exists.

Ad Hoc Committee: Nominees should be faculty members on the UC Davis campus with expertise appropriate for assessing the program being reviewed, but who are not members of the graduate program under review. To avoid a potential conflict of interest, ad hoc committee members should not have been involved in teaching in the program being reviewed. If potential ad hoc committee members have collaborated in research with any program faculty within the past five years, the PRC will review the nomination for conflict of interest.

External Reviewer: Nominees may be from any college or university outside of UC Davis. To avoid a conflict of interest, the individuals nominated as external reviews cannot have been involved in an active collaboration in either teaching, research, or have been a co-author on any research publications with faculty in the program within the past five years, be currently listed as a co-PI on a proposed grant, or co-instructor on a proposed course.

Stage V: Confidential Questionnaires

During the month of April, PRC will solicit confidential and anonymous comments from the faculty and students of the program, via an online questionnaire. **The comments are provided to the review team only—faculty, staff, and deans do not have access to the comments, the questions or any summarized data from the questionnaires.** A minimum 75% response rate is expected. The Review Team depends

heavily on these comments to discover what is going well and what needs improvement in the actual delivery of the graduate education described in the program's materials. The response rate also signals to the Review Team the engagement or disengagement of faculty and students in the program.

In the beginning of March, the PRC analyst will provide program chairs and staff with information regarding the questionnaire process, including a template for submitting email addresses. **It is important that programs provide current e-mail addresses of the faculty and graduate students in the program. Before the e-mail lists are submitted to the PRC staff assistant, the program is responsible for testing the e-mail addresses to confirm that they are correct and active.**

Stage VI: Submission of Self-Review Documents

In July, the self-review documentation, consisting of the Executive Summary and the Data Section, is submitted to the PRC analyst in Graduate Studies via Smart-site.

Stage VII: Review of Program

Once the review team is recruited, the PRC analyst will coordinate the scheduling of the review dates with the review team members and the program chair and staff.

For graduate programs, the review team meets **during a two-day period** with the program faculty (including the chair, graduate adviser(s), and executive committee), the graduate students, the graduate program staff person, relevant deans, and others as appropriate (e.g., off-campus faculty or representatives of industry, representatives of Graduate Council). It is the responsibility of the graduate program staff to schedule the relevant meetings. The program chair shall notify the graduate program's faculty and students of the dates, the names of the review team members, the 75% expected attendance at the review meetings, and convey the importance of participating in meetings.

The reviewer appointed for DEs and GACs will determine if an on-site review is necessary; if not, the reviewer will examine the self-review materials and the confidential questionnaires only, and make their report to the PRC accordingly.

Stage VIII: Reports

These are the reports associated with a program review:

1. The ad hoc committee (AHC) report;
2. The external reviewer (ER) report (for Ph.D. and M.F.A. granting programs only); and
3. The PRC report. This is the final report of the review to which the program and administrators will need to prepare a response to specific recommendations.

These reports will be provided to the program with the transmittal letter from Graduate Council, and should be shared with the entire faculty membership in the graduate program.

The AHC and ER reports are submitted to the PRC within 4 weeks from the date of the review. Once the reports are received, a request for correction of fact only to the reports will be forwarded to the program chair; the program chair should share these reports with the faculty membership for their assistance in preparing corrections of fact. **The purpose of the correction of fact is to look for errors only, not to make text changes or respond to a recommendation.**

Once the correction of fact is received from the program, the ad hoc report, external reviewer report and the correction of fact will be presented to the PRC for discussion. The PRC report will then be drafted, and will consist of a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and will focus on outcomes directed to specific faculty and administrators to address; the report will identify underlying concerns of the reviewers, general issues that need to be addressed, and suggestions for improvement. The report will be presented to the PRC for final edits and approval, and then presented to the Graduate Council for final action.

Graduate Council's letter of transmittal and the PRC reports will be forwarded to the department and program chair and administrators to whom the recommendations are addressed. The program and the administrators will be asked to respond to the PRC report by a set date. Graduate Council's correspondence and the associated reports **should be shared with the full faculty membership** for discussion and deliberation on how the program should respond; this is to allow for the democratic and open operation of the graduate program.

Stage IX: Follow-up Phase

The Follow-up Phase begins once the PRC reports have been forwarded to the department and program chair and administrators. The review provides an opportunity for the various parties to communicate regarding the review recommended outcomes, and to then to either implement actions that meet the outcomes, or provide a justification as to why an outcome is not possible to achieve. The Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC) is charged with reviewing the responses and making a recommendation of action to the Graduate Council to either close the review or for further action to be taken.

The PRCC is chaired by a member of the Graduate Council. PRCC shall consist of the immediate previous Chair of the Graduate Council, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Program Review Committee, the Graduate Dean or Dean's designee, and the PRC Analyst.

The committee will review the responses to the recommendations and follow up with those individuals, as needed. The PRCC will make a recommendation only after all parties have been given an opportunity to respond. The PRCC chair will forward a recommendation to the Graduate Council to either close the review or for further action to be taken. The following recommendations may be made to Graduate Council:

1. Closure of a review and initiation date for the program's next review: A program has satisfactorily responded to the recommendations and implemented them to be the best of its ability.
2. Closure of a review with a status report required or early initiation of the next review (instead of on the seven/eight-year cycle). A program has responded to the recommendations, but concerns remain regarding some unresolved issues in the program.
3. Further action recommended: If a program has not complied with the outcome recommendations of the PRC report, has refused to respond to the report, or PRCC's concerns have not been addressed, a recommendation will be forwarded to Graduate Council for further action. The process is as follows:

- The PRCC may ask the chair of Graduate Council to forward a letter to the program chair outlining the concerns of the Graduate Council and requesting a detailed response to outstanding issues. The program's response would be reviewed by PRCC and then forwarded to Graduate Council to consider the matter and determine whether a recommendation is needed to the Dean of Graduate Studies for further action.
- Actions that might be recommended to the Dean include:
 - Review of the program chair's service:
 - Graduate Group/DE/GAC: The Dean of Graduate Studies would initiate the review of the chair's service.
 - Departmentally-based Graduate Program: The Dean of Graduate Studies would forward a request to the relevant college dean to review the department chair's service.
 - Suspension of admissions to the program.
 - Closure/Discontinuance of the graduate program.

Stage X: Finalizing the Date of the Next Review

Typically, the graduate program's review cycle initiation date will be reset to fall eight years from the academic year that the program's response to the PRC report was due. Graduate Council retains the right to make regular adjustments to the schedule in order to balance the annual workload. In rare cases a review will be moved one year earlier. More typical will be moving the review one year later. The date of the next review will be confirmed once PRCC has completed the follow-up phase for the program review. This date will be reflected in Graduate Council's letter to the program regarding closure of the review or further action.

Chapter 4: Self-Review Document: Executive Summary Section

The guidelines for the Designated Emphasis self-reviews can be found at: [DE Review Guidelines](#)

The document should be able to stand alone; the composition is the responsibility of the faculty, and not that of the staff. The document provides a rare, valuable opportunity for the faculty to have a conversation about the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the graduate education they are delivering. Based on past experience, the best results are obtained if the chair prepares the document in collaboration with the faculty.

Great care should be taken in preparing the self-review as:

- The review team will use it as the foundation for its interview with faculty, students, and administrators and the foundation for their assessment and recommendations; and
- It will become part of the official record that will be included in subsequent reviews.

Graduate programs at UC Davis vary considerably; the features of the program that might not be clear to colleagues outside of the program should be explained. For example, explain the role of the master's degree in a doctoral program or the relationship between the graduate program and divisions within the home department. The structure of graduate groups often require a thorough explanation as to the role of the lead-Dean, the Departmental affiliation, if any, of the graduate administrator and the group chair, and the involvement of other Schools/colleges if appropriate.

For departmentally-based graduate programs, the focus must be only on aspects related to the graduate program. For instance, undergraduate department matters should only be included if they have a substantial impact on the graduate program.

The Executive Summary must be no more than a twenty page, single-spaced document that summarizes the program's strengths, weaknesses, and challenges. The document should follow the sequence of eleven topics listed below exactly. The writing should be concise and address all topics. *Do not simply refer readers to related, more detailed sections in the Data section.*

Section 1: Mission Statement

A review provides an occasion for a graduate program to revisit its mission statement or to write a new mission statement. The mission statement should be concise and no more than five sentences. It declares a distinctive mission for the program in both teaching and research. At its best, the mission statement embodies the faculty's philosophy regarding this field of study.

Section 2: History of the Program

Provide a brief history of the program in the order listed below.

1. Date the program was approved and date admissions were open (if the dates differ).
2. Name changes or mergers of the program and dates associated with those changes.

3. Administrative home of the program.
4. Degree(s) offered. Note: If a master's degree is offered but the students are not directly admitted to that degree objective, explain why and how the master's degree is used.
5. Bylaws: date last revision was approved by Graduate Council and URL where posted.
6. Degree Requirements- date of the last version approved by Graduate Council and URL where posted.
7. Mentoring Guidelines: date when the guidelines were approved by the program and URL where posted.
8. Dates the last review was initiated and closed.

Section 3: Standing in the Field

1. Provide a comparison with other comparable programs nationally and within the University of California System.
2. Include national rankings and sources, if they are available.

Section 4: Strategic Plan

Comparing the mission statement with the present state of the graduate program provides the basis for a strategic plan aimed at accomplishing the mission. **The strategic plan must be developed in consultation with the program's membership and approved by them.**

Although the strategic plan should describe resource needs, this document is different from the usual strategic plans written by departments for deans. This strategic plan focuses on the graduate program, not the department (if this is a department-based program).

It should project actions over the next review period and address (but not be limited to):

- Curricular evolution;
- Changes in the student population (in number and/or quality);
- Plans to shift programmatic emphasis;
- Approaches to developing new strengths or addressing weaknesses; and
- Plans to merge or subdivide to achieve programmatic focus.

Section 5: Research

1. Provide a summary of the areas of research (or specialties) that the graduate program encompasses.
2. If faculty members collaborate on research with others outside the program, briefly summarize those linkages.
3. If faculty members are involved in other collaborative efforts, provide a summary.

Section 6: Faculty

The Self-Review Data section will provide detailed information on individual faculty members' research interests and strengths. (Do not include CV's here, those are included in the data section 5.5.1.; a complete faculty list by name is required in 5.2.2.) In this section summarize the following information:

1. Provide the total number of faculty in the program for the last three years, who held membership consistent with the bylaws of the graduate program. Breakdown that total by:
 - (a) College/school.
 - (b) Department within each college/school.
2. Include information on markers of quality, such as research support, awards, prizes, election to the fellows of a professional society, etc. The review team realizes that these markers will vary considerably by discipline and area.

Section 7: Students

Graduate Studies will provide the required data for numbers 1 through 5 for graduate programs (data section 5.3); if they do not provide it, you are not required to collect it. Your narrative in this section should summarize salient points and briefly comment on the data provided by Graduate Studies. **If there are discrepancies in the data provided, please address those in this section.** Specifically, address the following issues:

1. The number of students that enrolled and who withdrew. *Note: If the average number of admitted students is four or fewer over the previous three years, provide a rationale for maintaining a graduate program this small.*
2. The number of master's and doctoral students who are domestic and international.
3. Time to degree.
4. Admissions and TakeRate:
 - (a) Provide a brief summary of the program's current admissions policies. If your program's admission policies are more stringent than those required by Graduate Studies, they should be explained (e.g., higher GPA, GRE, etc.)
 - (b) Summary of admissions and the "take rate" (percentage of students who are accepted that enroll.
5. A summary of:
 - (a) The percentage of students with financial support.
 - (b) The program's policy on financial support.
 - (c) How program fellowships/block grants are distributed.
6. Student representation and involvement in the graduate program and on administrative committees. Provide information on the program's graduate student organization; include how graduate students participate in policy matters pertaining to your program and the current status of any graduate student organization in your program. If a student organization is currently active, the student officers may submit this statement. If the program does not currently have a graduate student organization, provide a statement to that fact and explain why one has not been established.

Section 8: Courses and Curriculum

The graduate student handbook and other information included in the Self-Review Data section will provide details on the curriculum design, its rationale, its requirements, and descriptions of the core courses. In this section summarize information for the last five years:

1. Core courses: For each course provide:
 - (a) Course title;
 - (b) Frequency of offering;and
 - (c) A sentence or two aboutthe course.
2. Elective: Provide a list of electives.
3. Briefly describe changes to the curriculum since the last review. If there have been no changes, provide a statement to that fact.

Section 9: Diversity

Diversity, as defined by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in the University of California Diversity Statement in 2006 (see Appendix A) is a core component of excellence and quality in graduate education. As part of the judging of excellence, an assessment is required of steps a program is taking to yield a diverse graduate population. Diversity in graduate education in a program will be judged within the context of the findings of the University of California Regents Study Group on University Diversity report published in 2007.⁴ Note that diversity includes not only include international students, but primarily underrepresented minorities. In this section, address the following topics:

1. Evidence of a strategy for recruiting a diverse pool of applicants;
2. Demonstration that the faculty are committed to the academic success of all students and are sensitive to the special challenges faced by underrepresented and first generation graduate students;
3. Evidence of a culture of commitment to supporting a diverse graduate student population; and
4. Quantitative documentation of success in achieving diversity in applications, admissions, enrollment andcompletion.

⁴ Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity, page iv: "Absent discrimination, we believe the demographic profile of UC students generally will reflect the gender, racial and ethnic profile of the pools from which UC recruits and selects students. UC participation rates should reflect the demography of these pools. This aspiration stems from our belief in the necessity of educational opportunity and achievement for all."

<http://www.ucop.edu/graduate-studies/files/grad-prof-work-team.pdf>

Section 10: Alumni

Graduate programs and groups are strongly encouraged to keep track of their alumni, and seek their advice and input on their graduate programs. This section should attempt to provide detailed information on the current employment at least of those students who have graduated since the last review period. Programs may also include citations of publications from students' graduate research.

Section 11: Status Report

For programs previously reviewed provide:

1. Status of previous PRC report recommendations: Briefly provide the status of each of the recommendations from the previous PRC report.
 - Format: Each recommendation must reflect the same numbering and wording as in the original PRC report.
 - The status of the recommendations as of the date of the current review. Do not reiterate the response the program made to the recommendation during the previous review.
 - Describe briefly each remedy and evaluate its present effectiveness.
 - If any recommendations were not addressed, explain why.
2. Other key changes: Briefly describe any key developments that have not been already addressed in the previous section.

For programs being reviewed for the first time:

1. Since the program was approved: Briefly address how the program has evolved since the program proposal was approved.
2. Other key changes: Briefly describe these changes.

Chapter 5: Self-Review Document: Data Section

5.1 Documents from the Previous Program Review

This section contains either the documents from the program's previous review or the program's approved proposal (for programs being reviewed for the first time). The PRC analyst will provide one copy of the documents.

- **For programs previously reviewed:**
 1. The PRC analyst will provide one copy of the documents from the last review that must be included "as is" in this section. Documents provided include:
 - a. Graduate Council transmittal letter, with the PRC report attached.
 - b. The response(s) from the relevant parties (program, department, deans, etc.) regarding the PRC report.
 - c. Graduate Council PRC Closure letter, with the Program Review Closure Committee recommendation attached.
 - d. Other documentation pertinent to the individual program being reviewed (admission suspensions, etc.); only as needed.
- **For programs that are being reviewed for the first time:**
 1. Change the tab and section title to: "Approved Graduate Program Proposal."
 2. The PRC analyst will provide one copy of the approved program proposal and the approval letter from the Office of the President, which must be included "as is" in this section.

5.2 Program Administration

5.2.1 Administrative Profile

The administrative Profile is an overview of the organizational structure of the program. Provide the following information:

- **Program name:** If the name of the program has been changed since the program was approved, provide the history of the name.
- **Chairs:** List the current and past chairs and their term of service, since the program was approved. For departmentally-based programs, list the department chairs and graduate program chairs.
- **Graduate advisor(s)** for the current academic year, as appointed by Graduate Council.
- **Committees:** For the current academic year, list each committee and the members. This list should correspond with the committees listed in the program's bylaws. Do not provide a description of the committee, that information is included in the program's bylaws.

5.2.2 Faculty Membership List

Provide a list of the faculty (according to the program's bylaws and in accordance with the Graduate Council Policy on Membership in Graduate Programs) who have held membership in the program the last three years, their academic title, and department affiliation.

Format:

- Name: Provide first and last names of the faculty members (no nicknames).
- Academic Title: Provide the current academic title for each member.
- Department affiliation: Do not abbreviate department name; for departments in the School of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, indicate the school after the department.

Note: This is just a list; a CV is not required in this section, but only in data section 5.5.1.

5.2.3 Bylaws

Graduate programs may not operate under bylaws that have not been reviewed and approved by Graduate Council. All graduate programs must have been approved bylaws that are in compliance with Graduate Council's Bylaws Guidelines.⁵ The Graduate Council will notify the program chair if the bylaws need to be revised and submitted to Graduate Council for review. As part of the review process, programs are asked to review their bylaws for compliance with Graduate Council's Bylaws Guidelines. Programs should complete this process as soon as the review has been initiated and submit all revisions to the Graduate Council as soon as possible, but no later than the deadline each program is given. Approved bylaws for each program are listed on the Office of Graduate Studies webpage for each program: <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/programs/>.

⁵ [Policy on Bylaws for Graduate Programs](#)

5.3 Student Information.

The following requisite data will be provided by Graduate Studies: 5.3.1 through 5.3.6. Data can be included in this data section in exactly the same format that it was provided to the program. For this section, the only portion that the program must complete independently is regarding the alumni data in 5.3.7. All data is drawn directly from the Banner Student Information System and the Personnel Payroll System.

5.3.1 Current Graduate Students (provided by OGS)

The list will include winter, spring and fall quarter of the year preceding the review.

5.3.2 Summary Data (provided by OGS)

Summary statistics including applications, admissions, enrollment and graduation. Data goes as far back as is available. The percentage admitted is the ratio of admits to applications, and the percentage enrolled is the ratio of newly enrolled to admitted.

5.3.3 Application and Admission Data (provided by OGS)

Detailed information going back ten years. Both applications and admissions are broken down by degree objective, sex, and ethnic group identification. Average GPA and GRE scores for applicants are also included. The data for the latest year is not complete as the application season is not over yet.

5.3.4 Enrollment Data (provided by OGS)

Breakdown of enrolled students by degree objective, sex, ethnicity, and whether student is a new student or a continuing student. A few readmitted students are included as continuing students. For students with two simultaneous majors, they are counted in the program with their first major. Note that students onPELP or filing fee are not included.

5.3.5 Graduation Data (provided by OGS)

Detailed information on number of degrees conferred and mean time to degree, with a breakdown by degree, sex and ethnicity. The time to degree starts when a student was first enrolled in a program where the degree was conferred and ends when the student graduated with the degree.

5.3.6 Student Financial Support (provided by OGS)

Student financial support data for winter, spring, summer, and fall of the preceding year. Includes payroll stipend payments and corresponding FTE for TA and GSR positions, and fellowship stipend payments (which have zero FTE) paid from the Graduate Program Fellowship Allocation.

5.3.7 Alumni (as available, provided by the program)

Provide a list of students who have graduated since the last review and include the following information:

- Student name;
- Year graduated; and
- Most recent placement information: Employer, job title, city/state/country.

5.4 Admitting and Mentoring Students

5.4.1 Mentoring Guidelines

In June 1999, Graduate Council approved general mentoring guidelines and asked that each graduate program adapt the guidelines to the program's own specific disciplines and ideals for student-professor interactions.⁶ Each program must have mentoring guidelines. The guidelines should be posted on the program's Web site and it is expected that faculty and students should be annually reminded and notified where they are posted.

1. Provide a copy of the mentoring guidelines for the program. Note: If a program has no mentoring guidelines, then the chair should discuss with the program faculty:
 - (a) either, adopting Council's guidelines;
 - (b) or adapting the general guidelines for the program.
2. Provide an example of the announcement that annually notifies faculty and students of the program mentoring guidelines and the location of the URL.

5.4.2 Degree Requirements

Each graduate program must have a document, approved by the Graduate Council that contains all of the degree requirements for the master's and/or doctoral degrees that it offers and must share this document with its students. **A program may not impose requirements that have not been approved by Graduate Council.**

Provide a copy of your programs' most recently approved degree requirements⁷ and a copy of the approval letter from Graduate Council. If you do not have a copy of these documents, contact the PRC analyst for assistance. Most of the approved degree requirement documents are available on the Graduate Studies webpage for each program: <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/programs/>. Note: If this information is posted on the graduate program's Web site it must include:

- The date the degree requirements were approved by Graduate Council; and
- Must have the exact wording as the document approved by the Graduate Council.

In the event that it is determined during the self-review preparation that the program's degree requirements need revision the following policy and procedures must be followed: while a program is in the "review phase"⁸ degree requirements will not be reviewed by Council until the PRC and Council's transmittal letter have been forwarded to the program. Once the program review has been conducted and the program is in the "follow-up phase," degree requirement changes may be submitted for review and Council's Educational Policy Committee will consider them as a priority item. It is expected that the

⁶ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/mentoring.pdf>

⁷ This must be a verbatim version of the version approved by the Graduate Council; most approved degree requirements are posted on the Graduate Studies website for each program: <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/programs/>

⁸ The "review phase" covers the period from the date that the program's self-review is submitted to the Program Review Committee to when Graduate Council sends PRC report back to the program.

graduate program and the committee will work together to expedite the review, revision, and approval process. (Policy Regulating Programmatic Changes Submitted for Review by Graduate Council, approved December 2, 2016.) Refer to Graduate Council's Guidelines on Degree Requirements⁹ for information regarding format, submission of changes, etc.

If a program needs to update the degree requirements, they must submit the document for approval to the Graduate Council by the deadline imposed by the Graduate Council; the program will be notified of this deadline during the PRC Orientation.

5.4.3 Courses Taught

Provide a list of the program's core and elective courses, when they were taught and by whom for the past five years. This information should be organized by year. If a DESI report exists that focuses only on the courses taught by the program, it may be inserted.

5.4.4 Graduate Student Handbook

Each graduate program should have a "Graduate Student Handbook" with the information a graduate student needs to understand the graduate program's policies and procedures. This is a handbook separate from the Degree requirements required in Section 5.4.2., but should not contain conflicting requirements to the official and approved degree requirements. The Graduate Student Handbook should include practical information students need to negotiate the campus – how to get a library card, location of the health center, and so on – but the far more important information for new and continuing students includes the following (as examples):

- How to find a major professor and adviser; how to change major professors;
- The curriculum, with required courses, electives, and the required (or recommended) sequences in which students should take the courses;
- How to arrange for Independent Study (299) units as part of a student's program;
- How and when to put together a qualifying examination committee and a thesis or dissertation committee and the rules about the composition of those committees;
- Opportunities for graduate student participation in the governance of the graduate program;
- A sample checklist so the students can keep track of his/her progress toward the degree.

Graduate programs should consult with current graduate students while creating or revising the program's Graduate Student Handbook so that it answers the sorts of questions students have when they enter the program and at each stage in their continuing education.

If the Graduate Student Handbook is available on the graduate program's Web site, note the link and insert the handbook in the self-review document. If a program is in the process of developing a handbook, provide a copy of the draft document and information on when the document will be finalized and provided to students.

⁹ <https://gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/graduate-programs/policies>

5.4.5 Guidance Procedures

Provide the program's guidance procedures for new and continuing graduate students. While some of this information might be already contained in the Graduate Student Handbook, for clarity the guidance procedures should be repeated here. This section should include:

- Established procedures for selection for major professors and advisers;
- Guidelines for how recommendations regarding the appointment of examination and dissertation/thesis committees are made; and
- Samples of checklists used to track students progress to degree.

5.4.6 Teaching Assistant Training Program

If the program hires and trains its Teaching Assistants (TAs), please include:

1. The procedures for hiring and training TAs;
2. The University requires that departments hiring TAs provide the graduate student TA a clear, written statement about the duties of the TA for a course, including expectations about how the TA will spend an average of 20 hours a week (220 hours a quarter) performing those duties. Please provide a sample of up to five such statements for the courses for which graduate students in the program are hired.
3. If your program does not assign TAs, provide a statement to that fact.

Note: If the information requested for the Admission Policies, Guidance Procedures, and TA Training Procedures subsections is provided in the program's Graduate Student Handbook (or equivalent), that document may be inserted in the self-review. Include a cover page that lists all of the requested information and the page number in the handbook where it can be found.

5.4.7 GSR Compensation Plan

Include the program's latest approved GSR compensation plan. Consistent with a campus directive¹⁰ *"graduate programs are required to file a compensation plan for approval by the Dean of Graduate Studies outlining the rationale for the plan, the step in the title code they will use for initially hiring students and the program-specific qualifications students will need to meet. The compensation plan should also present the qualifications for students to advance to further steps in the title code and describe which steps the graduate program will use in the advancement process. Compensation plans must specifically identify percentage appointments by step during the academic year and during the summer. Graduate programs should review compensation plans on a regular basis, and no less than every three years, to ensure that salaries offered to students hired in this title are competitive."* A copy of the currently approved compensation plan is on file with the Office of Graduate Studies and must also be filed with the appropriate lead dean's office for the graduate program.

¹⁰ <http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/II-B.htm>

5.4.8 Recruitment Materials

Provide a copy of the program's current recruitment materials:

- Current recruitment materials, such as brochures and Web-site; and
- Sample letters to applicants and admitted students (include letters from Graduate Studies) and/or e-mail messages used in place of a letter.

5.5 Faculty Information

5.5.1 Abbreviated CVs

For each faculty member of the graduate program, provide an **abbreviated CV (two pages at the most)** that span over the last five years. Often this information is already available in grants that a faculty member has submitted recently to external agencies or foundations (NIH, NSE, etc.). In such an instance, use this abbreviated CV, otherwise provide the following information:

- Name;
- Highest degree, institution, year of degree;
- Area of expertise (twolines);
- Membership in the program's committees and other services to the program;
- Number of published, peer-reviewed papers. If the faculty member is in a book discipline (e.g., humanities), then describe briefly the book-length project. Faculty members in the performing or fine arts should indicate major performances or exhibitions;
- Five key papers that were published that are related to the program. Humanities and performing/fine arts should indicate their work with most relevance to the graduate program;
- Professional awards and honors (three lines maximum); and
- Service to profession (including consulting, where appropriate).

5.5.2 Memoranda of Understanding

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) are frequently used to clarify agreements between administrative units. For example, how to deal with cost overruns when amount of resources is less than the offers accepted, who is responsible for teaching assistant training, etc.. Include in this section any memoranda of understanding that specifically relate to operation of the graduate group/program.

Chapter 6: Format of Self-Review Documents

6.1 Presentation

The information must be presented precisely in the form described next.¹¹

Box

The PRC Analyst will set up a Box folder for each program under review, and will provide administrative access to the program chair and graduate program coordinator, who will be responsible for giving access to the appropriate program faculty, committees, students, etc. The PRC Analyst will provide guest access to the review team.

Folders: Three separate folders will be available:

1. Information folder.

The PRC Analyst will upload to this folder:

- a) These guidelines
- b) The documents from the previous program review for inclusion in the Executive Summary, and
- c) The data reports provided by Graduate Studies.

2. Program working files folder.

Programs may use this folder to share information within the program towards completion of the self-review documents. Sub-folders and documents can be created by the program, as desired.

3. Final Self-Review Documents folder.

The program will upload two separate PDF documents to this folder:

- Once the Executive Summary has been completed by the program faculty, one single PDF of the Executive Summary (with bookmarks or TOC) of the document should be uploaded in this folder by the program. It is the program's responsibility to upload this document by the deadline.
- Once the Data Section has been completed, one single PDF (with bookmarks or TOC) of the entire document should be uploaded in this folder by the program. The data reports should be included in the final document and not listed separately. It is the program's responsibility to upload this document by the deadline.

¹¹ If it is not in the required format, the PRC analyst will return the documents to the program for correction.

Appendix A: University of California Diversity Statement

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DIVERSITY STATEMENT RECOMMENDED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BY
THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate May 10, 2006 Endorsed by the President of the
University of California June 30, 2006

The diversity of the people of California has been the source of innovative ideas and creative accomplishments throughout the state's history into the present. Diversity – a defining feature of California's past, present, and future – refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstances. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.

Because the core mission of the University of California is to serve the interests of the State of California, it must seek to achieve diversity among its student bodies and among its employees. The State of California has a compelling interest in making sure that people from all backgrounds perceive that access to the University is possible for talented students, staff, and faculty from all groups. The knowledge that the University of California is open to qualified students from all groups, and thus serves all parts of the community equitably, helps sustain the social fabric of the State.

Diversity should also be integral to the University's achievement of excellence. Diversity can enhance the ability of the University to accomplish its academic mission. Diversity aims to broaden and deepen both the educational experience and the scholarly environment, as students and faculty learn to interact effectively with each other, preparing them to participate in an increasingly complex and pluralistic society. Ideas, and practices based on those ideas, can be made richer by the process of being born and nurtured in a diverse community. The pluralistic university can model a process of proposing and testing ideas through respectful, civil communication. Educational excellence that truly incorporates diversity thus can promote mutual respect and make possible the full, effective use of the talents and abilities of all to foster innovation and train future leadership.

Therefore, the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services, and administration, as well as research and creative activity. The University particularly acknowledges the acute need to remove barriers to the recruitment, retention, and advancement of talented students, faculty, and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently underrepresented.

Appendix B: Sample E-mail to Faculty

The sample e-mail below has been developed to assist the program chair in obtaining information from faculty.

Dear Colleagues: The *[insert name of graduate program]* is being reviewed this year by the Program Review Committee, a sub-committee of Graduate Council. We are required to submit a self-review for which we need the following information from you by *[insert deadline]*:

1. Abbreviated CV: Provide an *abbreviated* CV (two pages at the most) that span over the last five years. Often this information is already available in grants that a faculty member has submitted recently such as NIH or NSF. In such an instance, use this abbreviated CV. Otherwise, provide the following information:
 - Name;
 - Highest degree, institution, year of degree;
 - Area of expertise (two lines);
 - Membership in the program's committee and other services to the program;
 - Number of published, peer-reviewed papers. If the faculty member is in a book discipline (e.g., humanities), then describe briefly the book-length project. Faculty members in the performing or fine arts should indicate major performances or exhibitions;
 - Five key papers that were published that are related to the program. Humanities and performing/fine arts faculty should indicate their work with most relevance to the graduate program;
 - Professional awards and honors (three lines maximum); and
 - Service to profession (including consulting, where appropriate).

If you have any questions, please contact *[insert name of chair and/or staff]*. Thank you.