

**UC Santa Barbara  
Academic Review Procedures**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Purpose.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Review Process .....</b>	<b>1</b>
	A. Responsibilities .....	1
	B. Preparation .....	2
	C. The ERC Visit.....	2
	D. Reports .....	2
	E. Follow-Up.....	2
<b>III.</b>	<b>Review Sequence .....</b>	<b>3</b>
	A. Selection of Departments To Be Reviewed.....	3
	B. PRP Membership.....	3
	C. Final Report.....	3
	D. Review Schedule.....	3
<b>IV.</b>	<b>The Notebook .....</b>	<b>3</b>
	A. Campus Information .....	4
	B. Department Data .....	4
	C. Departmental Self-Assessment .....	5
	D. Departmental Development Plan .....	9
<b>V.</b>	<b>External Review Committee .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	A. Selection.....	9
	B. Site Visit.....	10
	C. Report.....	10
	D. Review Criteria .....	10

**Appendices:**

- A. Review Schedule
- B. Typical ERC Visit Schedule

## ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCEDURES<sup>1</sup>

### I. PURPOSE

The aim of periodic program reviews at UC Santa Barbara is to assess and improve program quality in academic departments and programs. Academic reviews of both undergraduate and graduate programs are used in departmental and institutional planning. The appropriate faculty committees use the review results in their recommendations, and the administration considers the review process in resource allocation. Most important, the review process provides the department with a periodic mechanism for in-depth evaluation of programs and goals.

UCSB's review process has been evolving since the 1980's, when it was initiated jointly by the faculty and administration. This document defines the *major* periodic reviews that are conducted of all academic units granting degrees (including interdisciplinary groups), on a cycle of approximately eight years. In addition, reviews of specific aspects of academic degree programs may be conducted from time to time by the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council. The Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) may initiate reviews, mid-cycle reviews, and follow-up to reviews at any time.

The following sections describe the review process, its time sequence and responsible agencies; preparation of the review Notebook, including guidelines for the department's self-assessment and development plan; procedures for the selection of the External Review Committee (ERC); and guidelines for the ERC's evaluation of the department or program. The term "department" is used throughout as shorthand for any academic unit that is subject to major review. The procedures are defined generically, and it is understood that modifications will be necessary to allow for the special needs of certain departments.

### II. REVIEW PROCESS

#### A. RESPONSIBILITIES

The Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) is the campus official responsible for academic reviews of departments. The Dean of the Graduate Division and the provosts and deans of the appropriate colleges or schools are closely involved in the program reviews. The Vice Chancellor for Research also may participate in ERC visits. For the task of overseeing the process, the EVC appoints a Program Review Panel (PRP); the Director, Academic Program Review, coordinates the panel's work.<sup>2</sup> The panel interacts with the department under review and with four faculty agencies: the three Academic Senate councils participating in the review (the Council on Planning and Budget, the Graduate Council, and the Undergraduate Council), and the Executive Committee of the college or school to which the department belongs.

The dean responsible for the department is involved at several stages in the review process. The department is encouraged to consult with its dean at the outset of the process, regarding particular issues to be addressed in preparations for the review. The dean meets with PRP during its discussion of the Notebook and preparation of the charge letter. The dean also is invited to provide written comments on the Notebook and on the ERC report and department response.

One significant aspect of the review is the report of an independent ERC, which bases its evaluation and recommendations on a site visit and written materials provided by the department and PRP.

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised July 27, 2004

<sup>2</sup> In this document, the title "director" refers to Director, Academic Program Review.

PRP oversees the preparation of the departmental review Notebook, coordinates the site visit by the ERC, and prepares a final report based on the ERC report, the departmental response to it, and comments from the four faculty agencies.

#### B. PREPARATION

The process of selecting members of the ERC begins with the department, which provides the EVC with the names of distinguished scholars in the discipline to act as nominators. The EVC then asks the nominators to identify several colleagues nationwide whom they deem most qualified to review the department. The department is asked to comment on each nominee, addressing potential conflicts of interest and assessing each nominee's standing in the discipline. Further details of the selection, functions, and operation of the ERC are provided in Section V.

The PRP chair and director meet with the department chair and the department staff manager to discuss the review procedures and deadlines. The statistical information in the Notebook (Section IV) is prepared jointly by the department chair and PRP director, assisted by the Office of Budget and Planning. PRP sends questionnaires to undergraduate majors and graduate students asking about all aspects of their educational experience: the climate for study in the department, space and facilities, curriculum, funding, and other relevant issues. The results of the surveys are transmitted to the department. Based on this information, the department chair and faculty prepare their self-assessment (see Section IV.C) and describe their development plan for the next several years (see Section IV.D).

PRP uses the Notebook as a basis for preparing a charge to the external review committee. In this task, PRP seeks comments from the four faculty committees and the dean, and meets with the department chair and with the dean to discuss the major issues to be addressed by the ERC.

#### C. THE ERC VISIT

Before the site visit, ERC members will have received the notebook and PRP's charge letter to assist in their evaluation of the department. When on campus, the ERC will meet with faculty and students of the department. In addition, the committee will discuss the review with the EVC, the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellors for Academic Personnel and for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy, the appropriate provosts and deans, and PRP. Further details of the visit are outlined in Section V.B.

#### D. REPORTS

After the site visit, the ERC assembles its findings in a written report. The report responds to the charge letter and addresses any other issues that the ERC considers important. The text of the report avoids identification of individuals by name. The department is given an opportunity to comment on this report. PRP then asks the dean and four faculty agencies for their observations on the ERC report and the departmental response.

PRP analyzes and evaluates all the information gathered in the review process and writes a final report to the EVC. Copies are provided to the department, appropriate provosts and deans, the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellors for Academic Personnel and for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy, the Director of Academic Personnel, and the four faculty agencies. Copies are also sent to the Chancellor, the University Librarian, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs.

#### E. FOLLOW-UP

On receipt of PRP's report, the EVC consults with the academic dean and sends a letter to the department identifying major issues and requesting specific actions as appropriate. The letter sets a date by which the department is to report on its progress, generally one year later. Copies of the letter

and all subsequent follow-up reports and correspondence are sent to the appropriate provosts and deans, PRP, and the four faculty agencies.

After not more than one year, the department submits a formal progress report to the EVC. The EVC may request comment on the report from the four faculty committees before responding to the department.

After three years, the department submits a second formal report to the EVC, with copies to the administrators and committees noted above. The EVC again may request comment on the report from the four faculty committees before responding to the department.

### **III. REVIEW SEQUENCE**

#### **A. SELECTION OF DEPARTMENTS TO BE REVIEWED**

The EVC consults annually with the provosts and deans of the schools and colleges, the Dean of the Graduate Division, and the Academic Senate to select departments for review. Normally, six departments are reviewed each academic year, allowing a complete campus review to be accomplished within an eight-year cycle.

#### **B. PRP MEMBERSHIP**

PRP consists of ten faculty members, one of whom serves as chair and one as vice-chair, two student representatives, and the director. The EVC appoints the faculty members in consultation with the Committee on Committees, the Council on Planning and Budget, the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and the Executive Committees of the schools and colleges. Faculty members are appointed to represent the breadth of academic disciplines on the campus, and serve for three years with overlapping replacement to ensure continuity. These appointments are made in the spring quarter for the coming academic year. In the fall, the EVC appoints one graduate and one undergraduate student representative, selecting from lists provided by the Graduate Students Association (GSA) and the Associated Students (AS). The student members' terms of appointment are for twelve months with the possibility of renewal for an additional year.

#### **C. FINAL REPORT**

The major document of the review is PRP's final report to the EVC. That document provides PRP's analysis and recommendations and includes the ERC report, the department's comments, and comments from the dean and the faculty agencies. The report is copied to all participants in the review process and to the Chancellor, the University Librarian, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs.

#### **D. REVIEW SCHEDULE**

A calendar of the review sequence follows as Appendix A.

### **IV. THE NOTEBOOK**

The notebook's general table of contents follows. Responsibility for the factual data rests with the administration\* (Director, Academic Program Review) or the department\*\* (Chair). The factual data usually span the six years prior to the year of the ERC visit. PRP may add or remove information as appropriate for a particular review.

## A. CAMPUS INFORMATION\*

1. Campus Overview
2. Research Rankings
3. Sponsored Project Funding
4. Organization Charts
5. Campus Statistical Profile
6. Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Requirements
7. Academic Review Procedures

## B. DEPARTMENT DATA

1. Current Faculty
  - a. By Rank\*
  - b. Teaching and Research Specialties\*\*
  - c. Gender and Ethnicity\*
  - d. Faculty Curricula Vitae\*\*
2. Faculty Data
  - a. Allocated Faculty FTE\*
  - b. Ladder Faculty Headcount by Rank\*
  - c. Age Distribution\*
  - d. Years of Service\*
  - e. Faculty Appointments\*\*
  - f. Faculty Departures\*\*
  - g. Research Funding Summary\*\*
  - h. Sponsored Research Awards\*
  - i. Academic Senate Research and Travel Awards\*
  - j. Non-Senate Research Appointments\*\*
3. Department Administration
  - a. Organization Chart\*\*
  - b. Faculty Committees\*\*
  - c. Department Administrative Bylaws\*\*
  - d. Department Instructional Workload Policy\*\*
4. Undergraduate Student Data
  - a. Enrollment of Majors\* (and number of students completing the minor if there is one)\*
  - b. Gender and Ethnicity of Majors\*
  - c. Degrees Conferred by Gender and Ethnicity\*
  - d. Academic Performance of Student Majors\*
5. Graduate Student Data
  - a. Admission and Enrollment\*

- b. Headcount\*
  - c. Gender and Ethnicity\*
  - d. GRE Percentiles\*
  - e. New Student Academic Achievement\*
  - f. Entering Graduate Students' Undergraduate Institutions\*
  - g. Graduate Student Support\*\*
  - h. Graduate Student Progress\*
  - i. Median Time to Degree\*
  - j. Degrees Conferred\*
  - i. Graduate Student Handbook\*\*
6. Instructional Program
- a. Catalog Description of Department Programs and Course Offerings\*
  - b. Frequency of Course Offerings (identifying undergraduate General Education courses)\*
  - c. Courses Not Offered in the Last Three Years\*\*
  - d. Instructional Funding Profile\*/\*\*
  - e. Student Credit Units\*
  - f. Student Credit Units by Faculty Rank\*
  - g. Student-Faculty Ratios (campus)\*
  - h. Enrollment of Undergraduate Majors by Department (campus)\*
  - i. Non-Senate Academic Appointments\*\*
  - j. Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses\*
  - k. Faculty Service on Graduate Committees\*\*
  - l. List of Master's Degree Theses\*\*
  - m. List of Doctoral Dissertations\*\*
  - n. Placement Data for Master's Degree Students\*\*
  - o. Placement Data for Doctoral Students\*\*
7. Student Surveys
- a. Undergraduate Upper-Division Majors\*
  - b. Graduate Students\*

NOTE: The department should have available (upon request) complete faculty vitae, course syllabi, and examples of student work (theses, dissertations, etc.).

#### C. DEPARTMENTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT

The departmental self-assessment is prepared by the department chair in consultation with department faculty. PRP encourages the department to consult with its academic dean before beginning the self-assessment. The process by which the self-assessment was compiled (drafted by chair and reviewed by department, drafted by one or more sub-committees and reviewed by department, based on discussion at department retreat, etc.) should be documented at the start. The purpose of the self-assessment is to explain trends in the field, describe the department's present situation, discuss present strengths and problem areas, and evaluate the department in the context of broader academic objectives. The self-assessment should address the issues listed below where appropriate and any other issues relevant to the review. It should cite evidence, such as data in other sections of the Notebook, whenever

appropriate, and avoid unsubstantiated assertions. Before addressing section C.5.c., the department should consult with the University Librarian to secure assistance. **This section should not exceed 20 pages.**

#### 1. THE DISCIPLINE

- a. What trends are currently evident in the discipline, both nationally and internationally? What subfields are currently growing or attracting major attention, and what subfields are declining?
- b. How is the department positioned in the discipline? What is the strength of the department in each of its major subfields? How is this strength likely to be affected by anticipated retirements?
- c. What measures are available to assess national standing, and how widely are they accepted in the discipline? What is the department's standing in the discipline on these measures?
- d. How do other strengths at UCSB contribute to the department's standing in the discipline?
- e. What forms of extramural funding are available in the discipline? How does the department compare to others nationally in its record of funding?

#### 2. THE FACULTY

- a. Comment on the continuing productivity and influence of the faculty.
- b. Comment on the balance in the department in terms of senior and junior appointments, diversity (women and underrepresented national minorities), and Senate versus non-Senate appointments. Describe the supply of potential faculty recruits, in relation to the need to achieve an appropriate balance in these categories.
- c. Comment on the balance of teaching and research specialties in relation to programmatic need. How does the mix of teaching specialties reflect current and anticipated trends in the discipline, and demand by graduate and undergraduate students?
- d. What is the faculty instructional workload policy?
- e. Are faculty members sufficiently active in the pursuit of extramural funds in light of funding possibilities?
- f. Comment on participation in significant multidisciplinary activity by faculty members. How do the activities of faculty contribute to the success of the broader UCSB community? How do formally and informally affiliated faculty contribute to the teaching and research mission of the department?
- g. Describe and evaluate the current system of governance in the department. Is there broad faculty participation in departmental governance and on campus committees?

#### 3. GRADUATE PROGRAM

- a. What are the goals of the graduate program(s), and what is the rationale for its content, structure (or lack thereof), and specialties? Discuss any graduate curricular problems and efforts to solve them.

- b. Evaluate the department's success in attracting and retaining graduate students. How would one characterize the applicant pool at the graduate level in terms of quality, size, diversity, etc.? How is the program advertised? What procedures and criteria are used to select the students for admission? What percentage of graduate students admitted in the past five years have had an undergraduate GPA of under 3.0?
  - c. What efforts are being made to recruit and retain students and to design the curriculum so as to achieve an appropriate ethnic and gender balance in the department?
  - d. How is the quality of student performance assessed at various stages of students' graduate careers? Do graduate students' grades show a sufficient range? Do they do so early enough to identify students who lack the appropriate preparation and motivation?
  - e. What is the attrition/success rate (in terms of advancement to candidacy and graduation) for the department? What factors contribute to the department's attrition/success rate? For example, how does the rate compare between those who entered with a 3.0 GPA or higher and those who entered with a GPA under 3.0? Are there differences in rates related to gender and ethnicity?
  - f. Evaluate the adequacy of support for graduate students. What percentage of students are funded, and how competitive are department financial offers with offers from other institutions? How are financial aid and fellowship decisions reached in the department?
  - g. How does the department provide academic advising? How does the department communicate the requirements of the program to incoming students? What other assistance does the department regularly provide to graduate students (e.g., tutorial help, study space, specialized libraries)?
  - h. What is the average time-to-degree for master's students? Doctoral students? How do these averages compare with averages for similar programs in the UC or at other major institutions of higher education? How does the department ensure that students progress toward completion in a timely and orderly manner?
  - i. Describe the climate for graduate study that the department fosters (a) in general, (b) for women, and (c) for historically underrepresented students? If there are problems, what specific efforts are being made to address them?
  - j. What assistance is available in career planning and job placement? Comment on the department's placement record for graduate students who have received their degrees in the past five years.
  - k. How would the department characterize the results of the graduate student survey? Are they generally representative of the experience of graduate students in the department?
  - l. Describe the participation of graduate students in the governance of the department.
4. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM
- a. What is the rationale for the department's undergraduate instructional program(s)? How does the department ensure that curricular offerings permit majors to complete their degrees in a timely manner (i.e., four years, 180 units)? Discuss any undergraduate curricular problems and efforts to solve them.
  - b. Describe departmental honors programs and projects, and the educational experiences they provide to qualified students.



- c. How is undergraduate research encouraged in the department, and how successful has the department been in this regard in recent years?
  - d. What efforts are made to encourage superior prospective undergraduate students to enter the major and to retain them to completion of the degree? What efforts are made to increase the diversity of undergraduate majors and to retain them to completion of the degree?
  - e. Describe the departmental major advising and general advising programs. What role does the faculty play?
  - f. How does the department monitor the quality of its undergraduates at the different stages of their studies, and how does it handle underperforming majors? Comment on departmental grading trends.
  - g. What efforts are under way to improve instruction? What sources of evidence (e.g., student evaluations, peer evaluation) does the department use to assess the quality of teaching? How is good teaching effectively encouraged? Comment on the mix of ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants in undergraduate instruction and on the level of contact between faculty and undergraduate students.
  - h. How are teaching assistants trained, supervised, and evaluated?
  - i. What measures other than the improvement of teaching itself could help raise the quality of instruction (e.g., classroom facilities, effective instructional equipment)?
  - j. What paths are taken by students after they graduate from the major, e.g., job placement rates, graduate and professional school admission rates? How does the department track its graduates?
  - k. How would the department characterize the results of the undergraduate student survey? Does it believe they are generally representative of the experience of undergraduate majors in the department?
  - l. Comment on the department's general education offerings with respect to frequency, enrollments in the past five years, and the level of appointments teaching those courses.
  - m. If the department's programs are subject to accreditation, comment on any recent reviews and their conclusions regarding quality of instruction.
  - n. How does the department provide access by students to its course syllabi?
5. SUPPORT SERVICES
- a. Assess the quality of the research and teaching environment with respect to the department budget, allocated space, and equipment.
  - b. Assess the adequacy of the department's administrative, clerical, and technical support staff.
  - c. Comment on the holdings, electronic services, special collections, and acquisitions policies of the library as they affect the department's functions.
  - d. Comment on the department's presence on the Web in relation to its ability to publicize its activities and to attract and retain excellent students.

#### D. DEPARTMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The development plan is an explanation of the department's plan for faculty and program development **over at least the next five years**. The document should address the following broad themes, and it should be clear how the department's plans for the future will evolve from its present situation as presented in its self assessment. The document should also address the department's plans for external fundraising through gifts and endowments. **This section should not exceed 10 pages.**

##### 1. FACULTY

List the overall goals of the department with regard to faculty recruitment. Include relevant data on recent or anticipated losses to retirements, projections for new permanent FTE needs, and diversity objectives. Indicate the foreseeable impacts of proposed positions on instructional and research programs, and set forth resource implications. What does the department consider to be its optimal size? How do recruitment plans mesh with national and international trends in the discipline in terms of both teaching and research specialties? How does the department plan to develop its interactions with other departments, and what efforts are being made to identify potential joint appointments?

##### 2. GRADUATE PROGRAM

List improvements the department wants to make in the graduate program. Outline steps it plans to take to improve the quality and increase the number and diversity of graduate students. Include relevant data on student enrollment projections and student interests in the field. Briefly summarize any anticipated changes in graduate offerings.

##### 3. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

List improvements the department wants to make to enhance its undergraduate program. Outline planned steps to improve the quality and diversity of the undergraduate students admitted to the department. Include relevant data on student enrollment projections and student interest in the field. Briefly summarize anticipated changes in undergraduate offerings.

##### 4. SUPPORT SERVICES

Outline any plans for improving the support the department provides to instruction and research. Discuss the department's plans for external fundraising to develop or increase gifts and endowments.

#### V. EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

##### A. SELECTION

The department submits to the Executive Vice Chancellor the names of at least five distinguished scholars in the field. These scholars each nominate approximately five colleagues nationwide whom they deem most suitable to conduct a review because of their professional stature, administrative competence, and perceived impartiality of judgment. The nominees should have had no recent close involvement with the department under review. PRP sends the list of nominees to the department for comment. The department responds in writing as to positive and negative attributes of candidates and potential conflicts of interest. PRP then recommends the committee's membership to the Executive Vice Chancellor, who invites the reviewers to serve.

An ERC ideally consists of three members, chosen to provide a) expertise in the major areas covered by the department, b) gender and ethnic diversity, c) expertise in issues confronting major public research universities, and d) familiarity with the unique environment of UC. In some cases a fourth member may be needed. Once a committee has been confirmed, PRP selects its chair.

## B. SITE VISIT

Prior to its campus visit, the External Review Committee is provided with copies of the Notebook and a charge letter from PRP identifying the most important issues. A site visit occurs during a regular academic session and requires the presence of all members of the ERC for the entire schedule. The visit normally lasts two days, but may be extended in the case of reviews of large departments or unusually complex reviews by moving one or more of the opening meetings with the PRP chair and director, the EVC, and other campus administrators to the previous evening.

The committee contributes an expert outside assessment to the overall review process. While on campus, its members meet with PRP, campus administrators, department faculty members, and student majors, and inspect selected facilities. They may also review the services provided by the library. PRP has established a standard sequence of events for the visits, which the ERC may wish to modify in consultation with PRP prior to the committee's arrival. During the site visit the committee typically meets with the PRP chair, the EVC, the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellors for Academic Personnel and for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy, the college provost and relevant deans, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the department chair, department staff, individual faculty, and students. A meeting with selected faculty from other departments provides an opportunity for discussion of cognate activities on the campus, and gives the ERC a broader perspective on the department. PRP hosts a working lunch for the ERC and arranges an exit interview with the EVC and the participating academic administrators. Some time is set aside on the schedule to be used at the discretion of the ERC. A typical schedule is provided in Appendix B.

## C. REPORT

The ERC is responsible for writing one report, which should be submitted within three to four weeks of the site visit. In case there is no consensus on a particular issue, all the differing opinions should be stated. Because this report is part of a process intended to help guide future departmental and campus decisions, the ERC should identify and address the issues most important in this context. The report should respond to the charge letter, making concrete and constructive suggestions for improvement, and should address any other issues the ERC considers important. The text of the report should avoid any identification of individuals by name.

## D. REVIEW CRITERIA

In conducting its review and preparing its report, the committee is requested to respond to the issues raised in the charge letter. The committee is asked to begin its report with a summary of major conclusions and recommendations, and to structure the remainder of its report as a response to each of the issues raised in the charge letter (the ERC may choose to identify some issues as unimportant, or not applicable). The charge letter will include generic questions selected by PRP from the list below as appropriate, and will include specific questions, assembled by PRP as a result of its own analysis of the Notebook, and the analyses provided by the four faculty agencies. Questions in bold in the following list are regarded by PRP as especially important.

### 1. OVERALL PROGRAM

- a. **What is your evaluation of the overall quality of this department?**

- b. **The National Research Council's study of research-doctorate programs published in 1995 ranked UCSB's department \_\_\_ (#/%) \_\_\_ among programs nationally. Is that an accurate ranking?** Are there other valid surveys or ranking systems that compare UCSB's department with similar programs nationwide?
- c. How does this department compare with others nationally in the diversity of its faculty and students? Are the department's efforts to foster diversity adequate?
- d. Please comment on the department's self-assessment. Does it accurately reflect the department's current objectives and activities? Its strengths and problems?
- e. Please comment on the department's governance, its structure and effectiveness, and the degree to which it engages faculty at all levels, graduate and undergraduate students, staff, and post-docs.

## 2. FACULTY AND RESEARCH

- a. **Please comment on the quality of the faculty and their scholarly activities.**
- b. Comment on the quality of faculty appointments made over the past five years.
- c. How do the department's teaching and research specialties compare with trends in the discipline? Is the balance among subspecialties in the department sufficient to meet the needs of the undergraduate and graduate programs?
- d. Is the number of faculty appropriate in relation to the goals of the department and the number of students it serves?
- e. Please comment on the availability of extramural funding and the success of the faculty in competing for those funds.
- f. Is the faculty teaching load policy described on page \_\_\_\_\_ of the Notebook consistent with that of \_\_\_\_ departments in other highly ranked research universities?
- g. What is your assessment of morale and relations among the faculty?

## 3. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

- a. **What is your assessment of the content and organization of the curriculum? Do course offerings adequately reflect current trends in the discipline? Are they appropriate to the needs and aspirations of a diverse student population?**
- b. Is the department's minor appropriately structured?
- c. Is the number of majors typical given the size of the faculty and the campus? Are they of high quality?
- d. Comment on the quality of undergraduate instruction and on the use of teaching assistants and non-ladder-rank faculty. To what extent is the scholarly or creative work of the faculty integrated into the undergraduate program?
- e. Comment on opportunities for undergraduate research and on the effectiveness of the department's honors program.
- f. How would you assess the overall climate for undergraduate study?

- g. Is student advising adequate?

4. GRADUATE PROGRAM

- a. **Please comment on the quality and effectiveness of the graduate program. Are the graduate students of high quality? Is the size of the program appropriate?**
- b. **Comment on the content and organization of the curriculum. Do course offerings adequately reflect current trends in the discipline?**
- c. How do the amount and type of financial aid packages available for graduate students in the department compare with those offered by high-ranking departments around the country?
- d. Comment on the overall climate for graduate study and on the department's efforts to attract and retain a diverse population of graduate students.
- e. Assess the training, supervision, and evaluation of teaching assistants.
- f. Please comment on how the department evaluates graduate student progress in the program. How effective is graduate student advising?
- g. Please comment on the job placements of recent program graduates.

5. DEPARTMENT STAFF AND FACILITIES

- a. Is the ratio of support staff to faculty typical of departments of this size? Given the department's support needs, are staff responsibilities allocated reasonably across positions?
- b. Please comment on the department's facilities and equipment. Are they sufficient to support the department's continued development?
- c. Please comment on the holdings (monographs, serials, and electronic resources) and services available to the department from the library. Are they sufficient to support superior teaching and research?

6. DIRECTION OF THE FIELD

- a. **In what direction(s) do you believe the discipline will evolve over the course of the next ten to fifteen years? Is UCSB's department well-positioned to take advantage of those disciplinary trends?**
- b. What placement opportunities for graduate students will be available during this time?

7. DIRECTION OF THIS DEPARTMENT

- a. **Where does this department fit into the field nationally? Does it have a particular "niche"?**
- b. Can existing resources be deployed more effectively to increase this department's quality and reputation?

- c. Please comment specifically on the department's five-year development plan in the context of campus resources. Are projected appointments in subfields that will lead to a distinctive profile for the department and increased national prominence?**
- d. Please comment on the possibility and desirability of greater interdisciplinary collaboration between the department and other campus programs with related concerns.
- e. Of the changes you have recommended or areas that you have identified as needing attention, which ones will require substantial assistance from the college or university administration?

## Appendix A Review Schedule

	<b>Campus Administration</b>	<b>PRP</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Faculty Agencies</b>
Previous Spring/Summer Qtr	EVC consults with provosts/deans/faculty agencies to select departments to be reviewed  EVC notifies departments and starts process; asks departments to identify nominators  EVC writes to nominators requesting the names of potential reviewers	PRP chair and director meet with department chair and staff manager [may also occur in fall quarter]	Provides names of nominators	
<b>Year 1</b>				
Fall Quarter		Begins factual data; conducts student surveys	Begins compiling factual data for notebook  Comments on nominee list	
Winter Quarter	Invites external reviewers	Recommends reviewers to EVC  Completes factual data; completes student surveys	Reviews data, student survey results  Begins self-assessment and development plan	
Spring Quarter			Completes data and self-assessment and plan and submits materials to PRP	
<b>Year 2</b>				
Fall Quarter	Reviews notebook  Invites students to participate in site visit	Transmits notebook to faculty agencies Transmits notebook to ERC  Discusses notebook; interviews chair; interviews dean; prepares charge to ERC	Chair meets with PRP to discuss issues for review	Review notebook, provide comments to PRP
Winter Quarter	Participates in campus site visit	Hosts ERC (with department)  Transmits ERC report to department	Hosts ERC (with PRP)  Comments on ERC report	Participate in PRP-ERC lunch
Spring Quarter	Receives PRP report (including ERC report, department and faculty agency comments)	Transmits ERC report and department response to faculty agencies  Prepares final report	Receives copy of PRP report	Comment on external review and department comments  Receive copy of PRP report
<b>Follow-up</b>				
Immediate	EVC requests one-year progress report			
One Year After Review	Comments on progress report		Prepares progress report	May comment on one-year report
Three Years After Review	Comments on progress report		Prepares progress report	May comment on three-year report

**Appendix B**  
**Typical Schedule**  
**External Review Committee Site Visit**  
**Academic Program Review of Departments**  
**University of California, Santa Barbara**

Time	Meeting
<b>DAY ONE</b>	
7:30 a.m. - 8:00 a.m.	Orientation with PRP Chair, Vice Chair, and Director, Academic Program Review and Accreditation
8:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.	Executive Vice Chancellor; Associate Vice Chancellors; Dean of college, division, or school; Executive Director, Academic Affairs; Director, Academic Administration; Program Review Panel Chair; Vice Chair, and Director, Academic Program Review and Accreditation
8:45 a.m. - 9:45 a.m.	Dean of college, division, or school; Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education; Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Chair of Department
Noon - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch in Department
1:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	Individual faculty interviews (each faculty member meets with one reviewer for 30 minutes)
3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.	Group meeting with undergraduate majors
4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.	Group meeting with graduate students
Early Evening	All-faculty reception followed by <i>committee-only</i> dinner
<b>DAY TWO</b>	
8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Individual faculty interviews; group meetings with staff and lecturers
10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Group meeting with cognate and affiliated faculty
11:00 a.m. - Noon	External Review Committee discretionary time
12:15 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.	Working lunch with the Program Review Panel
1:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	External Review Committee discretionary time; typically used to discuss report
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Concluding meeting (oral report) with Executive Vice Chancellor; Associate Vice Chancellors; Dean of college, division, or school; Executive Director, Academic Affairs; Director, Academic Administration; Program Review Panel Chair; Vice Chair, and Director, Academic Program Review and Accreditation