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Welcome Program Chairs and Staff

Animal Behavior  Andrew Sih & Theresa Garcia
Art  Youngsuk Suh & Victoria Dye
Communication  George Barnett & Cat Huff
Cultural Studies  Robert Irwin & Aklil Bekele
Economics  Ann Stevens, Douglas Miller & Marilyn Dexter
English  Elizabeth Miller, Lucy Corin, Mark Jerng, Robin Alexander & Darolyn Striley

Forensic Science  Robert Rice & Deborah Roberts
Linguistics  Robert Bayley & Cat Huff
Master of Professional Accountancy  Robert Yetman, Daria Costello & Christine Lyles
Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology  Catherine VandeVoort & Dawne Shell
Nutritional Biology  Sheri Zidenberg-Cherr & Caroline Eikenbary
Plant Pathology  David Rizzo & Jesa David
Psychology  Paul Hastings, Karen Bales & Angela Scully
Spanish  Maria Colombi, Ana Peluffo & Mandy Bachman

DE – Biophotonics  Laura Marcu
DE – Organism-Environment Interaction  Gabrielle Nevitt
DE – Reproductive Biology  Stuart Meyers
DE – Stem & Progenitor Cells  Alice Tarantal & Ellen Tani
DE – Translational Research  Frederick Meyers & Stacy Hayashi
DE – Writing, Rhetoric & Composition Studies  Chris Thaiss

* Colleagues can often assist each other and share best practices
Purpose of Program Review

It is the responsibility of the Graduate Council to “conduct regular reviews of graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness.” (Davis Divisional Bylaw 80)

It provides an opportunity for graduate programs to:
• assess past performance, identify problems or potential issues, determine goals for the future, and set priorities to meet those goals
• receive outside critique and recommendations
• raise issues with department chairs/lead deans/graduate studies that are important to the vitality of the program
• highlight program accomplishments
Evaluation Criteria

• Quality and regular delivery of the curriculum
• Quality and diversity of the students
• Record of student achievement (e.g. awards, time to degree, placement)
• Whether the facilities, faculty, and student support resources are in place and robust enough to deliver the program successfully
• How other graduate/UG programs on campus are positively impacted by the program
• How the program compares nationally and within the UC
• How the program contributes to the needs of the nation and state
• Future of the discipline
Program Review Responsibilities

Chair and Faculty of the Program

• **Primary responsibility for the program review**
• Meet and discuss the self-review process
• Nominate reviewers (internal and external)
• Write the Executive Summary
• Develop, contribute, and submit review material documentation in a timely manner
• Complete the faculty survey, meet with the on-site review team, and meet to discuss and respond to the review recommendations

Staff

• Assist the chair and faculty with the compilation of review materials
• Submit faculty and student email lists for survey distribution
• Arrange meeting time & space for the on-site review
Review Teams

• Reviews are conducted by a committee:
  
  **PhD/MFA programs**: 3 UCD faculty make up the internal Ad Hoc Committee and 1 non-UCD faculty serves as the external member. One of the 3 internal faculty serves as Chair of the AHC and presents the review reports to PRC and Graduate Council.

  **MS-only programs**: 3 UCD faculty make up of the review committee (there is no external reviewer).

• **Review team nominations**: review team members are selected by the Program Review Committee, but the nominations come from the graduate program, the graduate dean, and the Graduate Council. **Due Nov. 14, 2014.**
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Review Teams

• Qualifications:
  • Cannot be members of graduate program being reviewed, should not have been involved in teaching for the program.
  • Will not have collaborated with members of the program in the last 5 years. It is the program’s responsibility to note if there has been collaborative research and to indicate why this does not constitute an important conflict of interest.
  • Unassailable credentials who have experience in graduate education in the appropriate discipline AND someone whose comments will be compelling to the program faculty.
  • Programs do not need to contact the nominees for willingness to serve or availability: just provide 10 internal faculty and 5 external faculty nominations! The list of names should be in rank order and should include the nominee’s campus department or campus mail address, phone number, e-mail address and a brief statement detailing the important or unique qualifications of each nominee regarding their potential service as a reviewer of the graduate program.
Self-Review Document

Consists of two parts: the Executive Summary & the Data Section

The document provides a rare, valuable opportunity for the faculty to have a conversation about the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the graduate education they are delivering. Based on past experience, the best results are obtained if the chair prepares the document in collaboration with the faculty.

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

Consists of two parts: the Executive Summary & the Data Section

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.
Executive Summary

This is the responsibility of the Chair and faculty (and not the staff). See page 20 of the guidelines.

- No more than a twenty page, single-spaced document that summarizes the program’s strengths, weaknesses, and challenges.
- The writing should be concise and address all topics. Do not simply refer readers to related, more detailed sections in the Data section.
- **Sections include:** mission statement, history of the program, standing in the field, strategic plan, research accomplishments, quality of the faculty, quality of the students (based on OGS-provided data), curriculum, diversity, alumni, and improvements since last review (for programs that have been reviewed previously).
- Past review documents will be made available to the reviewers.
Data Section

See page 25 of the guidelines

- Documents from the previous review: Lisa will post to SmartSite a single pdf of all the documents required. For programs who have not been previously reviewed, Lisa will post the approved program proposal.

- Other sections include: administrative profile (details about the degree), faculty membership lists, approved bylaws and degree requirements, data reports (provided by OGS), alumni information, mentoring guidelines, courses taught, handbook, guidance procedures, TA training, GSR compensation plan, recruitment materials, faculty CVs (abbreviated, 1-2 pgs), and MOUs.
Details of the Review

- Guidelines & Example Self-Review
- Process and Timeline
- SmartSite
- Deadlines & Resources
Graduate Program Review

The purpose of Graduate Program Review is to promote excellence in graduate programs at UC Davis. The review, conducted by the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, is an opportunity for programs to evaluate past achievements, current status, and future directions related to graduate education.

Approximately 10 programs are reviewed each year, with the expectation that each graduate program be reviewed every seven years. Occasionally, a program may be reviewed more frequently by administrative request or where problems have arisen that require Graduate Council’s (GC) 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 closure of a program. For those programs that are excellent, the review process will endorse this excellence.

- Schedule of Program Reviews
- 2014 – 2015 Program Review Guidelines
- 2015 - 2016 Program Review Guidelines
- 2015 - 2016 Program Review Staff Guidelines
- 2014 – 2015 DE Review Guidelines
- 2015 - 2016 DE Review Guidelines
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Process
Fall 2014- Spring 2015

- Review team nominations (due Nov. 14)
- Program conducts self-review (2014-15)
- Confidential comments solicited from faculty and students (email list due March 6, 2015)
- Data reports from Graduate Studies posted to SmartSite (March 13, 2015)
- Program reviews data (April 3, 2015)
- Program submits self-review (due July 17, 2015)
- On site review (~2 days, Fall Quarter 2015)
- Recommendation from Grad Council for further action or closure of review
- Assessment of response by PRCC
- Response from program & administrators
- Grad Council transmits reports to program for response to recommendations
- Report submitted to Program Review Committee (PRC) to make recommendation to Graduate Council
- Program provides corrections of fact to reports
- Review team drafts report(s)
See page 27 of the guidelines. All data provided by OGS is drawn directly from the Banner Student Information System and the Personnel Payroll System.

5.3.1 Current Graduate Students (provided by OGS)

5.3.2 Summary Data (provided by OGS)

5.3.3 Application and Admission Data (provided by OGS)

5.3.4 Enrollment Data (provided by OGS)

5.3.5 Graduation Data (provided by OGS)

5.3.6 Student Financial Support (provided by OGS)

5.3.7 Placement of Alumni (as available, provided by the program)
The On-Site Review

- **Date**: 2 consecutive days, targeted for fall quarter. Lisa gathers the availability of the external reviewer, the program, and the 3 members of the ad hoc review team. Please understand the difficulty of scheduling, and be as flexible and accommodating, as possible.

- **Itinerary**: the Grad Program Staff will be provided with a sample itinerary, and is responsible for creating the itinerary, scheduling rooms, notifying faculty & students of meetings, and collecting sign-ups for meetings (advice from Lisa, as needed).

- **Meetings**: the reviewers (internal & external) will meet with the faculty and students (2 meetings for each group), the chair, the staff, and the advisers. Additional meetings may be arranged, as needed.
  - The Chair will have separate meetings with the reviewers but should also participate in the faculty and/or adviser meetings. (different hats)
  - The external reviewer and the ad hoc committee chair will also meet separately with the Lead Dean.

- **Questions from the reviewers** are based upon the review criteria provided by the Graduate Council, the self-review documents and the information gleaned from the confidential questionnaires.
Graduate Studies will create a dedicated SmartSite for each program by November 1, 2014. Chairs and Staff have been added as editors; others may be added, as needed, by staff or chairs.

SmartSite Folders: In the Resources section of SmartSite, the Program Review Guidelines and three separate folders will be available (please do not create additional folders):

1. Graduate Studies-Provided Information folder.
   The PRC Analyst will upload to this folder: a) the documents from the previous program review for inclusion in the Executive Summary, and b) the data reports provided by Graduate Studies.

2. Program working files folder
   [PLEASE NOTE: Optional folder provided by Grad Studies for Program use – docs and folder will be deleted once final self-review documents have been submitted.]
   Programs may use this folder to share information within the program towards completion of the self-review documents. Sub-folders and documents can be created by the program, as desired.

   The program will upload two separate PDF documents to this folder: the Executive Summary and the Data Section (both with TOCs). It is the program’s responsibility to upload these documents by the deadline.
**Important Dates**

- **Nov. 14, 2014**: Review team nominations due
- **March 6, 2015**: Faculty & student name/email list due for confidential questionnaire
- **March 13, 2015**: Data reports posted to SmartSite
- **April 1, 2015**: Data report inquiries due back to Graduate Studies
- **April 2015**: Questionnaires initiated
- **July 17, 2015**: Self-review documents due
- **Fall 2015**: On-site reviews

*Degree requirements and bylaws: if these documents need to be updated, this can be done after the Graduate Council transmittal letter has been distributed.*

Contact: Judi Garcia, (530) 752-0623 judgarcia@ucdavis.edu