

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

Revision October 2009

Contents

Chapter 1: Program Review Information	4
1.1 Graduate Program Reviews	4
1.2 Guidelines for Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs	5
1.2 Master’s-Only Graduate Programs	7
Chapter 2: Guidelines for the Review Team	9
2.1 Basis of the Review	9
2.2 Meetings	9
2.3 Review Questions	9
2.3.1 General.....	9
2.3.2 Faculty	10
2.3.3 Student Education.....	10
2.3.4 Course Curriculum	11
2.3.5 Student Financial Support.....	11
2.3.6 Resources and Infrastructure.....	11
2.3.7 Diversity	12
Chapter 3: Program Review Stages	13
Stage I: Notification of Review	13
Stage II: Orientation Meeting	13
Stage III: Self-Review Preparation.....	13
Stage IV: Review Team Nomination and Recruitment.....	13
Stage V: Confidential Questionnaires	14
Stage VI: Submission of Self-Review Documents.....	15
Stage VII: Review of Program.....	15
Stage VIII: Reports.....	15
Stage IX: Follow-up Phase	16
Stage X: Finalizing the Date of the Next Review	17
Chapter 4: Self-Review Document: Executive Summary	18
Section 1: Mission Statement	18
Section 2: History of the Program.....	18
Section 3: Standing in the Field.....	19
Section 4: Strategic Plan	19
Section 5: Research	19
Section 6: Faculty	20
Section 7: Students	20

Section 8: Courses and Curriculum	21
Section 9: Diversity	21
Section 10: Alumni	22
Section 11: Status Report.....	22
Chapter 5: Self-Review Document: Data Section	23
5.1 Document from the Previous Program Review	23
5.2 Program Administration.....	23
5.2.1 Administrative Profile	23
5.2.2 Faculty Membership List.....	23
5.2.3 Graduate Student Organization	24
5.2.4 Bylaws	24
5.3 Student Information	24
5.3.1 Current Graduate Students.....	24
5.3.2 Aggregate Data	25
5.3.3 Student Financial Support.....	25
5.3.4 Alumni	26
5.3.5 Benchmark Data.....	26
5.4 Admitting and Mentoring Students	26
5.4.1 Mentoring Guidelines	26
5.4.2 Degree Requirements	26
5.4.3 Courses Taught.....	27
5.4.4 Graduate Student Handbook	27
5.4.5 Guidance Procedures	28
5.4.6 Teaching Assistant Training Program.....	28
5.4.7 GSR Compensation Plan.....	28
5.4.8 Recruitment Materials	29
5.5 Faculty Information.....	29
5.5.1 Faculty Research Grants.....	29
5.5.2 Abbreviated CVs.....	29
5.5.3 Memoranda of Understanding	30
Chapter 6: Format of Self Review Document	31
6.1 Presentation.....	31
Chapter 7 Deadlines and Contact Information.....	34
Appendix A: University of California Diversity Statement.....	35
Appendix B: Sample E-mail to Faculty	36

Chapter 1: Program Review Information

1.1 Graduate Program Reviews

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

Approximately 10-12 programs are reviewed each year, with the expectation that each graduate program be reviewed every 7-8 years. Occasionally, a program may be reviewed more frequently by administrative request or where problems have arisen that require Graduate Council's consideration. Where opportunity for improvement is identified, the review will give guidance to the program and to administrators about how such opportunities may be pursued. Where programs are inadequate, the review will suggest concrete steps to rectify weaknesses and enable a return to an acceptable standard. In some cases, Graduate Council may recommend 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 12-15 Academic Senate members, one Academic Federation representative, one graduate student representative, and two ex-officio members (the Graduate Dean or his/her delegate and a PRC staff assistant). 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 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.-granting programs only). The review team is selected from lists generated with input from the program chair and faculty, relevant deans, and PRC members. The ad hoc committee is chaired by the PRC liaison (an active member of the PRC) and two other UCD faculty members in aligned fields who are not members of the graduate program under review. External reviewers are selected from a list of prominent members of the appropriate fields who are outside UCD.

Designated Emphases (DE's) and Graduate Academic Certificate programs (GAC's) reviews are conducted by one campus faculty, and have no external reviewer.

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

- The program's self review
- 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
- Reports from the review team

- The program’s corrections of fact to the review team’s reports
- The PRC report and the Graduate Council letter of transmittal
- Responses from the program and administrator’s to the PRC report and the Graduate Council letter of transmittal
- 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.

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 UCD.

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 <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/Grad%20Council%20Guidelines%20Eval%20Prior%20Grad%20Prog.pdf>

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, block grant funds, graduate student admission quotas) and to determine the viability of programs within the broad context of graduate education on the campus.

1.2 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

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.

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 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.

Chapter 2: Guidelines for the Review Team

2.1 Basis of the Review

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

2.2 Meetings

The 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.

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. *The review team is asked to specifically look into questions that are in italics, which are issues of common emerging concern to graduate education at UC Davis as determined by a survey conducted in 2006 by Graduate Council.*

2.3.1 General

1. What are the goals of the program? What role in terms of its educational offerings and research is the program expected to play on the campus? In the University as a whole? Is the program meeting its own goal and the expectations of others?
2. Does the program fulfill its role in:
 - (a) Attracting students of promise?
 - (b) Recruiting and retaining faculty members of quality following its University and campus affirmative action plans?
 - (c) Justifying the instructional resources it requires?
 - (d) Flexibility in accommodating changes in the campus mission?
3. How does the quality and productivity of the program compare with other programs in the same discipline?
4. Using relative standards of comparison from the most outstanding programs in the discipline (indicate comparison within the University of California and nationally), how does the program compare in:
 - (a) Breadth of faculty (collectively) and their professional reputations?
 - (b) Facilities, library holdings, and financial support for further development?

- (c) Providing a learning environment conducive to excellence in research and scholarship?
 - (d) The quality and number of students in view of the facilities for research, size of the faculty, and career opportunities for graduates?
 - (e) Student demand (e.g. for graduate students, the ratio between applications and admission within the previous five years)?
 - (f) Placement of graduates in prestigious positions?
5. Are the national rankings of this program reflecting the state of the program? Has the program achieved any specific national recognition?
 6. What special characteristics does the program possess in relation to other analogous programs within the University? Does the program exploit opportunities for interaction with related programs on the campus or within the University? What is the impact on other campus programs and on the other programs within its own department?
 7. Has the program changed or developed special emphasis to incorporate new knowledge and skills to meet the changing needs of students and the University?
 8. What is the program's promise for future development and contributions? What are its plans for the future?
 9. Is the program meeting the needs of the discipline? Of the students? Of the state? Of society?
 10. What is needed to improve the program significantly?

2.3.2 Faculty

1. What is the state of the faculty morale?
2. Has the program motivated and enabled faculty members to use and develop new knowledge in the discipline?
3. Is there a sufficient faculty FTE to support the program?
4. Is the faculty participation adequate to support the objectives of the program?
5. Does the faculty receive appropriate credit for participation in graduate education?

2.3.3 Student Education

1. What is the state of the student morale?
2. With what other universities is the program competing in regards to graduate student recruitment?
3. Has the program motivated students to participate fully in the discipline?

4. *Are the students being mentored and advised in a manner that is appropriate for the discipline?*
5. Does the program ensure that consistent information is provided to students as well as advising on program requirements?
6. What contributions do the program's students make to the decision-making, planning, and program organization?

2.3.4 Course Curriculum

1. *Is there a vision/cohesiveness to the course offerings in the program?*
2. *Are the core courses curriculum, the number or types of courses/regularity of offerings and the number of electives appropriate for the discipline?*

2.3.5 Student Financial Support

1. Does the program provide sufficient financial support for its students?
2. *Is the number of multiyear fellowship adequate?*
3. *Is the nonresident tuition support adequate for the number of international students in the program?*
4. *Is there a sufficient number of research assistantships available in the program?*
5. *What is the role of TA teaching in the program? What educational functions do teaching assistantships serve for the TAs? Is there a TA training program? Is there a sufficient number of TA positions available in the program? How are the TA assignments for the graduate students in the program made?*

2.3.6 Resources and Infrastructure

1. Are sufficient resources being allocated to the program to allow it to meet its goals? Are the resources allocated to it used efficiently?
2. Is the program as productive as possible given the resources available to it?
3. *Are there space concerns that limit the graduate program?*
4. *Is the number of FTEs appropriate for the existing size of the program? How many FTEs will be needed to realize future objectives?*
5. *Is there sufficient administrative support?*
6. What is the state of the graduate staff morale?
7. *In terms of facilities, is there an equipment lack or inadequacy?*
8. Is there a lack of and/or inadequacy of technical support?

2.3.7 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 and scholars 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 reflects our belief in the necessity of educational opportunity and achievement for all. However, we do not advocate achieving participation rates through quotas or other preferences based on race or gender. Furthermore, we maintain that diversity is a core component of excellence, and as such will further enhance the quality and excellence of the University. A careful assessment of excellence would therefore yield a diverse graduate population.”*³

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-in-family 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?

³ <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/Grad-ProfWorkTeam.pdf>, page 30

Chapter 3: Program Review Stages

Stage I: Notification of Review

In the early fall quarter, Graduate Council will initiate the reviews of graduate programs for the subsequent academic year. Notification of a pending review will be sent to the program the previous spring quarter.

The program chair is responsible for the 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 could be responsible for gathering data for the review, it is the responsibility of the faculty to compose the Executive Summary of the self-review which includes the Mission Statement and the Strategic Plan.

Stage II: Orientation Meeting

In fall, the PRC chair will host an orientation meeting with the chairs of the graduate programs to be reviewed. The purpose of the meeting will be to answer questions regarding the self-review process and the self-review document. Once the meeting has been held, the graduate program chair should notify the program's faculty and students of the review; explain the importance of participating in the preparation of the self-review document, the confidential questionnaires, and the review meetings; and direct them to the Program Review Web page that describes the review process.¹

Stage III: Self-Review Preparation

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

1. Gathering and compilation of the data for the program review;
2. Review by the faculty of the program's bylaws, degree requirements, faculty membership, mentoring guidelines, student's handbook, and the program's Web site.
3. Preparation by the faculty of the executive summary based on their analysis of the data collected.

Stage IV: Review Team Nomination and Recruitment

In fall or early winter, letters requesting nominations for the review team members will be e-mailed to the graduate program chairs and relevant deans (the chair and deans will submit separate lists). The Review Team will consist of a three-member ad hoc committee; and, for Ph.D. granting programs, an external reviewer. Programs must not contact people they are nominating. The nominations for the review team should consist of:

¹ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/prc/index.html> and <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/prc/prcguidelineslatest.pdf>

1. a list of five 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 a ranked order and the following information provided for each nominee:
 - (a) Nominee's campus department or campus mail address, phone number and e-mail address.
 - (b) A brief statement detailing the important or unique qualifications of each nominee regarding his/her potential service as a reviewer of the graduate program.

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 concerns. 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 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 graduate program, via an online questionnaire. 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 by the program's materials. The response rate also signals to the Review Team the engagement or disengagement of faculty and students in the program.

At the beginning of winter quarter, the PRC assistant will provide program chairs with information regarding the questionnaire process. It is important that programs provide **accurate** and **current** e-mail information on the faculty who hold membership and students enrolled in the program. Obtaining accurate and current e-mail information is essential to the process. **Before the e-mail lists are submitted to the PRC 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 assistant.

Stage VII: Review of Program

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

The review team meets **during a two-day period** with the program's faculty (including the chair, graduate adviser(s), and executive committee), the graduate student, the graduate program staff person, relevant deans, and other as appropriate (e.g., off-campus faculty or representatives of industry).

Upon confirmation of the review date, 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.

While the responsibility for the coordination of the review lies with the PRC chair, the scheduling of the actual review meetings is determined by the PRC assistant. The assistant will work in collaboration with the Graduate Program Staff to develop the review itinerary and explain the process for the review meetings.

Stage VIII: Reports

There are three reports associated with a graduate program review:

1. The ad hoc committee (AHC) report;
2. The external reviewer (ER) report (for Ph.D. granting programs); 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.

The AHC and ER reports are submitted to the PRC chair 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 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 PRC report will be drafted. This report is a summary of the ad hoc committee and external reviewer reports and the correction of fact, if any. The report will be presented to the Program Review Committee for final edits and approval, and then presented to the Graduate Council for final approval.

Graduate Council's letter of transmittal and the PRC report will be forwarded to the program chair and administrators to whom the recommendations are addressed. Graduate Council's letter may address specific recommendations or may provide additional recommendations. The program and the administrators will be asked to respond to the PRC report by a set date.

Stage IX: Follow-up Phase

The Follow-up Phase begins once the PRC report has been forwarded to the addressees of the recommendations. It provides the opportunity for various parties to communicate regarding the review recommendation and to then implement the recommendations or provide a justification as to why this is not possible. The Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC) is charged with the follow-up and recommendation of action of Graduate Council. The committee is chaired by the PRC chair. Members include current and past chairs of the Graduate Council, the past chair of the Program Review Committee, the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, and the PRC Assistant.

The committee will review the responses to the recommendations and follow up with those individuals as needed. Typically, not only the program under review is asked to provide a response. 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 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 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 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

The Executive Summary should be able to stand alone as a relatively brief, concise document of the larger self-review. The composition of the Executive Summary is the responsibility of the faculty, and not that of the staff. It is a rare, valuable opportunity for the faculty to have a conversation about the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the graduate education they are delivering. The Executive Summary should be based on the data in the self-review, and thus should be prepared only after the self-review data has been compiled. Past experience demonstrated that the best result is obtained if the chair prepares the Executive Summary based on collaboration among the faculty.

Great Care should be taken in preparing the Executive Summary 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 the Self-Review Data section of 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.

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 less 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 Self-Review Data section.*

Section 1: Mission Statement

A review provides the 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.
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.**

The strategic plan should describe resources needs, certainly, but 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 five to seven years (until the next review) and address (but not belimited 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. 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

For the last five years, summarize and briefly comment on the information in the order provided:

1. Total number of students, number enrolled per year, and the number who withdrew. If this is the program's first review, the period of time to report on starts on the date the program was approved. 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; time to degree, including the average and range.
3. Admissions and Take Rate:
 - (a) Provide a brief summary of the program's current admissions policies for new and continuing graduate students. If your program's requirements differ from those required by Graduate Studies, they should be emphasized (e.g., higher GPA, GRE, etc.)
 - (b) Summary of admissions and take rate. Explain any drastic deviations in the period.
4. A summary of GPAs and standardized test scores; indicate whether the trend for these markers is rising, falling, or remaining relatively constant.
5. Summarize the percentage of students with financial support for:
 - (a) Support from all sources;
 - (b) The percentage coming from the block grant;
 - (c) Per capita support (with and without tuition/fee remissions)
 - (d) Include what portion of support comes from fellowship, GSRs and TAs, and training grants.
Note: This data should focus only those student in the graduate program; and
 - (e) Multi-year packages.
6. Student representation and involvement in the graduate program and on administrative committees.

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 about the 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 2007.¹ In this section, the self-review report of diversity must 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-in-family 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 and completion.

¹ Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity, page 30,: “Absent discrimination, we believe the demographic profile of UC students and scholars 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 reflects our belief in the necessity of education opportunity and achievement for all. However, we do not advocate achieving participation rates through quotas or other preferences based on race or gender. Furthermore, we maintain that diversity is a core component of excellence, and such will further enhance the quality and excellence of the University. A careful assessment of excellence would therefore yield a diverse graduate population”

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/Grad-ProfWorkTeam.pdf>

Section 10: Alumni

Graduate programs and groups are strongly encouraged to keep track of their alumni, seek their advice and input on their graduate programs. The alumni section of the Self-Review Data Section will provide detailed information. In this section summarize information on the placement record of your alumni for the last five years, including professional positions and their participation in ongoing program projects (internships, guest lectures, etc.).

Section 11: Status Report

For programs previously reviewed provide:

1. Status of 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 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 Document 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 assistant will provide one copy of the documents. The program is responsible for making the appropriate copies for the self-review binders/CDs.

- **For programs previously reviewed:**
 1. The PRC assistant will provide one copy of the documents from the last review that must be included "as is" in this section.
- **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 assistant 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 chair and graduate program chair.
- **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) 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; more detailed information on the faculty will be provided later in the self-review (see Section 5.5).

5.2.3 Graduate Student Organization

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.

1. If a student organization is currently active, the student officers may submit this statement.
2. 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.

5.2.4 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.¹ The PRC assistant 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 compliances with Graduate Council’s Bylaws Guidelines. Program’s should complete this process once the review has been initiated and submit all revisions to the Graduate Council 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/>

5.3 Student Information

5.3.1 Current Graduate Students

Provide a roster of currently enrolled graduate students in the program (include those on PELP, In Absentia, and filing fee status). The information should be presented in a table containing the following: i) Name of student, ii) Year enrolled and degree status (e.g. MS, PhD, Filing fee, PELP), iii) Graduate GPA, iv) Major professor, v) Undergraduate GPA. Table 5.1 is an example.

Table 5.1: Current Student Data: 2009-10

Name	Enrolled/Status	Grd GPA	Prof.	UG Deg,	UG Inst.	UG GPA
John Jones	2005/PhD	3.8	A. Smith	B.A.	Worton	3.75
Emily Seed	2004/PhD, Fil. Fee	3.9	P. Drown	B.Sc.	Peppermill	3.4
Juan Rush	2007/MS PELP	3.5	R. Peters	B.A.	Swarthmore	3.65

¹ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/bylaws/index.html>

5.3.2 Aggregate Data

Most of the aggregate data are available from Office of Graduate Studies: Publications: Data Reports.² The following information is required:

1. Basic statistics (extract data from the last eight years, and present in one table)
2. Application, admission, and new enrollment headcount (select all years available)
3. Enrollment headcount by student type (select all years available)
4. Enrollment headcount by degree objective (select all years available)
5. Enrollment headcount by gender (select all years available)
6. Enrollment headcount by citizenship (select all years available)
7. Total enrollment headcount (select all years available)
8. Annual average enrollment (select all years available)
9. Number of graduates by degree conferred (select all years available)

The information can be downloaded into formatted Excel spreadsheets and, with the exception of the first item, the format can be used as is.

The average GRE scores for the admitted and the enrolled students are required for one representative year. Graduate Studies is in the process of making GRE information available online, but for now the programs will need to provide the average GRE (or equivalent such as GMAT) data. Table 5.2 is an example.

Table 5.2: Average GRE of Admitted Students – Fall 2009

	GRE Anal.	GRE Quant.	GRE Verbal
Domestic Admitted	80%	92%	86%
Domestic Enrolled	84%	96%	89%
International Admitted	81%	91%	83%
International Enrolled	83%	88%	78%

5.3.3 Student Financial Support

For this section, Graduate Studies generates a report on support that the program's graduate students received. The report will be provided to the programs by the PRC assistant. The report should be inserted in the self-review document. No other action is required for this section.

² <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/publications/start.cfm>

5.3.4 Alumni

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.

5.3.5 Benchmark Data

A benchmark data report will be provided to the program to be inserted in the self-review. This report is generated from Banner and includes the number of applicants received, the number of students admitted and enrolled, and the number of master's/doctoral degrees conferred. The report should be inserted in the self-review document. No other action is required for this section.

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.³ 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 requirements⁴ and a copy of the approval letter from Graduate Council. If you do not have a copy of these documents, contact the PRC assistant for assistance. Most of the approved degree requirement documents are available on the

³ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/mentoring.pdf>

⁴ 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/>

Office of 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"⁵ 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 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 May 14, 2003.) Refer to Graduate Council's Guidelines on Degree Requirements⁶ for information regarding format, submission of changes, etc.

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. 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/policiesall.html%20%20#3>

Graduate program 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, print out a copy and insert 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.

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

1. Your procedures for hiring and training;
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 on a separate page in the self-review.

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 directive⁷ *“graduate programs is required to file a compensation plan with their dean's office outlining the rationale for their plans, the initial step in the title code they will use for initial hiring of students, and the qualifications students will need to meet. The compensation plan should also present the qualifications*

⁷ <http://gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/panman/GSRimplementation.pdf>

for students to advance to further steps in the title code and what steps the graduate program will use in the advancement process. Graduate programs should review compensation plans on regular basis to ensure that salaries offered to students hired in this title are competitive. For group-based programs, the compensation plan should be filed with the appropriate lead dean.” Programs should be aware that UCOP periodically adjusts GSR salary scales, which results in automatic salary increases for a given percent time appointment. Current salary scales are available at <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0809/table23.pdf>. For all graduate programs, a copy of the original compensation plan and any updates to the plan should also be filed with the Office of Graduate Studies.

5.4.8 Recruitment Materials

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

- Current recruitment materials, such as brochures and Web-site print-outs; 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 Faculty Research Grants

For the last five years provide a list of the grants held by the faculty in the graduate program – **only** those grants that support graduate students in the program. That is, grants that do not support the graduate students in the program should not be included. If the grant also supports students in other programs, the information must be broken down to only account for the number students in the graduate program under review.

Provide the following information:

1. Source (e.g., NIH, not name of grant);
2. Dates of the grant (life of the grant);
3. *Estimate* the number of students in the graduate program under review supported by the grants, by providing:
 - (a) Time period of that support; and
 - (b) Total percentages appointed per quarter.

5.5.2 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 such as to 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 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).

5.5.3 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 Document

6.1 Presentation

The information must be presented precisely in the form described next.¹ Programs have two options for presenting the self-review: all hard copy (see section A below) or a combination of hard copy and electronic format (see section B below). The presentation order remains the same, regardless of the format it is submitted in.

A. All hard copy

The Executive Summary and the Data section must be presented in two separate binders, and the number of copies required is:

- For Master's/Ph.D. programs: six copies (12 binders total).
- For Master's-only programs: five copies (10 binders total).

The presentation of the **Executive Summary** document shall be as follows:

- Binder Size: Appropriate to the size of the document.
- Cover and Spine: Include **Executive Summary [program name] 2010-2011**.

The presentation of the **Data Section** document shall be as follows:

- Binder Size: Appropriate to the size of document.
- Cover and Spine: Include the **Data Section [program name] 2010-2011**.
- Tab Dividers: Each section and subsection must be presented in the following order and separated by tabs and a colored sheet of paper with the title of the section of subsection:

- 1. Documents from the Previous Program Review²**

- 2. Program Administration**

- (a) Administrative Profile*

- (b) Faculty membership list*

- (c) Graduate student organization*

- (d) Bylaws*

- 3. Student Information**

- (a) Current Graduate Students*

¹ If it is not in the required format, the PRC assistant will return the documents to the program for correction.

² If the program is being reviewed for the first time, the section title and tab should be **Approved Graduate Proposal**.

- (b) *Academic Qualifications*
 - (c) *Student Financial Support*
 - (d) *Alumni*
 - (e) *Benchmark Data*
- 4. Admitting and Mentoring Students**
- (a) *Mentoring Guidelines*
 - (b) *Degree Requirements*
 - (c) *Courses Taught*
 - (d) *Graduate Student Handbook*
 - (e) *Guidance Procedures*
 - (f) *TA Training Procedures*
 - (g) *Recruitment Materials*
- 5. Faculty Information**
- (a) *Faculty Research Grants*
 - (b) *Abbreviated CVs*

B. Combination Hard Copy & Electronic (CDs)

Two copies of the Executive Summary and the Data section must be presented in two separate hard copy binders (total of four binders), plus you'll need to present five copies of one CD containing both the Executive Summary and the Data Section (total of five CDs). In total, you would present four binders and five CDs.

The presentation of the **Executive Summary** document shall be as follows:

- **Hard Copies:** binder size should be appropriate to the size of the document. Cover and spine labeling should include "**Executive Summary [program name] 2010-2011**"
- **Electronic Copies:** CDs should be labeled by program name and year. There should be a separate Word file on the CD named "**Executive Summary [program name] 2010-2011**" (note that the CD should contain both the Executive Summary and the Data Section, see below).

The presentation of the **Data Section** document shall be as follows:

- **Hard Copies:** binder size should be appropriate to the size of the document. Cover and spine labeling should include "**Data Section [program name] 2010-2011**". Tab Dividers: Each section and subsection listed below must be presented in the following order and separated by tabs and a colored sheet of paper with the title of the section or subsection:

- **Electronic:** A separate folder on the CD named: **“Data Section [program name] 2010-2011”**. Inside the Data Section folder on the CD, each of the following numbered items should be separate files named as stated below (Word files are preferred, but we understand *some* may have to be in PDF):
 - 1. Documents from the Previous Program Review²**
 - 2. Program Administration**
 - (a) Administrative Profile*
 - (b) Faculty Membership List*
 - (c) Graduate Student Organization*
 - (d) Bylaws*
 - 3. Student Information**
 - (f) Current Graduate Students*
 - (g) Academic Qualifications*
 - (h) Student Financial Support*
 - (i) Alumni*
 - (j) Benchmark Data*
 - 4. Admitting and Mentoring Students**
 - (h) Mentoring Guidelines*
 - (i) Degree Requirements*
 - (j) Courses Taught*
 - (k) Graduate Student Handbook*
 - (l) Guidance Procedures*
 - (m) TA Training Procedures*
 - (n) Recruitment Materials*
 - 5. Faculty Information**
 - (c) Faculty Research Grants*
 - (d) Abbreviated CVs*

² If the program is being reviewed for the first time, the section title and tab should be **Approved Graduate Proposal**.

Chapter 7: Deadlines and Contact Information

- January 4, 2010: Deadline for submission of any changes to the degree requirements and bylaws. After the self-review submission deadline, changes to degree requirements and bylaws cannot be approved until closure of review.
- January 25, 2010: Review Team Nominations due to the PRC Assistant.
- March 1, 2010: Revised bylaws submitted to Graduate Council for review and approval (see Section 5.2.4).
- March 22, 2010: Faculty and student email information submitted for the confidential questionnaire process.
- April 2010: The confidential questionnaire process is initiated.
- July 19, 2010: Deadline for submitting the self-review. Copies of the self-review should be delivered to the PRC Assistant.

CONTACT PERSON: For questions regarding the format and procedures used during the review, and to deliver your self-review, please contact Lisa Marquez, PRC Assistant:
lgmarquez@ucdavis.edu
(530) 752-1763
Office of Graduate Studies, 250 Mrak Hall

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. Current Faculty Research Grants (extramural support only that pertains to the graduate program):
 - (a) Source (e.g., NIH, not name of grant);
 - (b) Dates of the grant (life of the grant); and
 - (c) Estimate the number students in the graduate program under review supported by the grant, by providing:
 - i. Time period of that support; and
 - ii. Total percentage appointed per quarter.

If none of the funds are used to support students in the program, indicate “none.”

2. Alumni: Attached is a list of your past students. Please update the following information for each student:
 - Current job title and employer.
 - City/State/Country
3. 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.