Revised October 9, 2026

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

Adopted by the Committee on Educational Policy on 11/29/06, Revised 11/27/12, 03/19/14, 05/21/14, 04/17/15, 02/05/16, 05/26/17, 04/06/18, 03/06/20, 8/10/20, 10/15/20, 02/05/21, 05/07/21, 01/07/22, 06/28/22, 11/04/22, 03/03/23, 06/02/23, 03/01/24, 04/05/24, 02/07/25, 12/05/25, 03/06/26, 10/09/26

I. Overview

Reviews of undergraduate programs are conducted by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), with the aid of extramural review teams, and supported by the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The review policy has been approved by the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The primary aim of the review process is to help improve undergraduate programs across the campus.

CEP may conduct internal reviews to evaluate undergraduate programs as circumstances warrant. For example, an internal review may be recommended to assess the progress of an undergraduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review, to evaluate the progress of new undergraduate programs, or to evaluate a small program with low enrollment. Please consult Appendix A for full details on internal review procedures. Additionally, internal reviews are conducted for BCoE programs with the ABET accreditation reports. Please consult Appendix B for the process for the internal review of BCoE programs with ABET.

The default modality for undergraduate program reviews is in-person, although programs may petition for a remote review. External and/or internal undergraduate program reviews are subject to be conducted remotely when circumstances are present that do not allow for in-person gatherings. A decision to conduct a review remotely in response to the aforementioned situations will be made by CEP.

The Committee on Educational Policy establishes the sequence of program reviews, which is reviewed annually. The sequence can be altered by action of the CEP. At least four programs are reviewed every year (and the goal is that each program will be reviewed at least once every seven years.) The current sequence of reviews is available from the Academic Senate.

II. Program Self Study

The undergraduate program to be reviewed is notified in the year proceeding their review. Program's requests to postpone reviews will be considered on a case-by-case basis by CEP. At the time of the notification, the program is asked by the CEP Chair to prepare a self-study document, which will be transmitted to the external review team. This will become a part of the permanent record of the program review and will be filed together with the report of the review committee. The program should direct any questions or dialogue concerning the review to the CEP Review

Chair and CEP Senate staff analyst. The self-study is no more than five single-spaced pages in length not including data appendices and should be a thoughtful and thorough self-evaluation of the program, based on the participation of the program's faculty, staff and students. The program should provide an electronic copy of their entire self-study package to the CEP.

The self-evaluation document contains the following required seven categories:

I. Introduction and Contact Information
II. Program Goals and Description
III. Learning Outcomes and Assessment Results
IV. Student Data
V. Instructional Facilities
VI. Institutional Support
VII. Faculty Data

Most of these are self-explanatory and should be generated internally by the program/unit. The exception to this is the student admission and performance data listed in section IV, which is provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the program's self study. The three satisfaction surveys listed in sections IV. and VII. have been formulated by the CEP and will be conducted electronically through the Academic Senate Office. The program does need to provide a list of all program faculty including their full name, title, UCR net ID and email address. These data are needed to conduct the faculty surveys. Student and Alumni contact information for the student and alumni satisfaction surveys will be provided by ITS.

Structure of the Program Self-Study: Please submit all of the program self-study documents, etc. in the following order:

I. Introduction and Contact Information

- Administrative structure of the program, starting with the Dean and including the substructure within the program. If applicable, units associated with student advising outside the program and committees and individuals within the program that play a major role in student affairs should be included.

II. Program Goals and Description

- Educational philosophy and vision. What do you want your students to learn and what skills do you want them to develop?
- Perceived strengths and weaknesses of program
- Recruitment and outreach plans
- Department/program diversity, equity, and inclusion statement
- Major changes in the program since the last review (if applicable)
- Any issue the program wants to bring up that would be helpful to the review committee

Separate addenda (to be included as an appendix):

- I&R Faculty FTE and faculty/student ratios
- Structure of degree(s) and specialty tracks
- All courses taught in past three years by Lecturers and Associates In
- Class sizes at the introductory and upper division levels
- Courses in your program taught by faculty from outside your program
- Courses in other programs to which your faculty contribute
- Program expenditures related to undergraduate education
- Syllabi from one required lower-division/introductory course and one required upper-division course in the program
- OPTIONAL- syllabi for additional course(s) that the program may find important for the review team's information

III. Learning Outcomes and Assessment Results

- The assessment report needs to focus on what you believe that your majors should know upon graduation, and what skills they should possess. The assessment report can be tailored to reflect the strengths of the program. The learning outcomes need to be addressed in terms of how they are assessed by the program. Whenever appropriate the learning outcomes should be mapped with the five core competencies identified by the Western Associate of Schools and Colleges (WASC) summarized in Attachment E. Results of a recent learning outcomes assessment may be useful here.

IV. Student Data

- Five-Year summaries as of Fall quarter of each academic year including time to degree data (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study)
- Job placement data for majors after graduation (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study)
- Financial support including extramural grants, academic and research fellowships, and financial aid
- Advising, mentoring and career development
- Undergraduate research or other scholarly activity with information on presentations and publications
- Selected data from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) results for majors (This information will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self study).
- Undergraduate Satisfaction Survey and Alumni Satisfaction Survey (This information will be provided by CEP and only be made available to the external reviewers and CEP. Note that, historically, response rates for these surveys have been low across all UG Program Reviews.

V. Instructional Facilities

- Classrooms
- Instructional laboratories
- Information resources such as library and computer resources

- Role of instructional technology in the classroom and teaching laboratory
- Statement of future needs/requirements

VI. Institutional Support

- Staff personnel allocations for the last three years. This should be limited to staff involved in the teaching mission of the program. (e.g., academic advisors, personnel associated with the operation of the teaching laboratories, etc.)
- TA allocations for the past three years
- Demographic and diversity data for Teaching Assistants noting gender, ethnicity/race, and age. (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self-study)
- Institutional services

VII. Faculty Data

- For each faculty member, include a summary with the following. (See the standardized form in Attachment C of this document for composition of the faculty summaries):
  1) Academic biographies including publication data
  2) Area(s) of specialty and their impact on the undergraduate degree programs
  3) Grants that impact the undergraduate program including undergraduate research
- Three-year teaching load data for each faculty member
- Program workload summary with discussion of major-related and service instruction for other programs
- Distribution of faculty among sub disciplines for past 5 years and recruitment plans for the future
- Teaching evaluations for all undergraduate courses for the previous two years. The evaluations will be made available to only the external reviewers and CEP. Instead of including the information in the self-study due to the size of the content, it will be provided separately to the reviewers at the time of their visit.
- Demographic and diversity data for Senate faculty and Unit 18 non-Senate faculty noting gender, ethnicity/race, and age. (Provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP for enclosure in the self-study)
- Faculty Satisfaction Survey (This information will be provided by CEP and made available to only the external reviewers and CEP.)

III. Composition of the Review Team

External review teams include at least one faculty member from a UC campus and at least one member from a peer institution. A letter containing wording similar or identical to the following is sent by the CEP Chair to the Chair of the program under review to request suggestions for the membership of the external review team:

> "The general policy specifies that normally one of the external reviewers will be a faculty member at another UC campus, and the other reviewer(s) will come from UC peer institutions. It is strongly desired to have members on the external review team who are tenured and ladder rank faculty. Please provide a ranked list of at least 12 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other campuses of the UC system and the rest from UC peer institutions throughout the U.S. If appropriate for your program, please divide the list of names into sections corresponding to subdisciplines, so that reviewers can be selected to appropriately span the range of subdisciplines in your program.
>
> The CEP requests that you do not focus exclusively on a candidate's research record or institutional reputation when developing a list of reviewers. Other relevant traits should be given strong consideration as well. These include teaching, advising, and administrative experience in undergraduate programs, particularly programs that are similar to yours or that exhibit characteristics that your program desires to achieve in the near future. CEP requests that programs recommend candidates that will be able to advise on UCR's unique student population given its status as a minority-serving institution (MSI).
>
> The CEP also asks to be **assured in writing that the proposed external visitors can carry out a neutral review**. The committee is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty: (1) personal friendships; (2) visitor and UCR faculty member present in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) Recent (within past five years) cooperative teaching or research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these items applies to a visitor, the individual should be eliminated or the Chair of the CEP Review Subcommittee should be informed of the facts of the relationship."

For each proposed external reviewer, the program should provide complete contact information and a link to each potential reviewer's curriculum vitae. Particular attention is directed to gathering as much information as possible about the experience and dedication of the nominees to undergraduate education. After the list of ranked potential reviewers has been submitted, the CEP then selects a final ranked list of review team candidates. The CEP Chair contacts the individuals and, upon their acceptance of the invitation to participate in the review, sends them an official appointment letter. The Senate Office coordinates the Review Team travel, travel expense reimbursement and honoraria payment.

The CEP Subcommittee formulates a 'standard' set of questions that the Extramural Team may (not "must") use to guide its deliberations; most of the questions are used for all programs, but some are program specific. The program is provided with the questions that are sent to the Extramural Team.

About thirty days prior to the review, the information from the program self-study and a package of additional information (contents of the package follow below) are sent by the

Senate Office to each member of the Extramural Team. An identical information package is provided to the members of the CEP Review Subcommittee. The program, College Dean, appropriate College Academic Associate/Divisional Deans for undergraduate education, VPDUE, and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost receive copies of the review material without the faculty, student, and alumni satisfaction surveys for the purposes of confidentiality.

The following items are included in packets sent to Extramural Team members along with the Program Self Study:

1. Tentative schedule

2. Link to current UCR General Catalog

3. Link to guidelines and questions for reviewers in CEP UPR Procedures

Approximately one week before the review, the CEP Analyst will distribute a final schedule to everyone on the original distribution list. The Chair of the CEP Subcommittee will discuss the schedule with the external review committee at their first meeting to see if they want any changes, and if possible, changes will be accommodated.

IV. Extramural Team Guidelines

The following guidelines are provided to the extramural team:

UCR is interested in your overall assessment of the teaching and research accomplishments and potential of the unit you are reviewing. The charge to the reviewer is to evaluate the educational programs as well as to make explicit comparison of the UCR program with comparable programs in other major universities. The Senate is most interested in your expertise in assessing the quality of the undergraduate instructional programs. Recommendations to increase resources may follow from this, but are not in themselves the primary responsibility of the reviewers.

It might be helpful to think of your review with the following questions in mind:

1. What is the overall quality of the program with respect to the following:

    a. Faculty teaching for both majors and non-majors
    b. Student satisfaction
    c. Undergraduate research
    d. Overall reputation

2. Is the undergraduate program coherent in the areas of teaching, counseling, mentoring, and introduction to research for its students? Is it adequate in scope and depth to insure education appropriate for the BA/BS?

3. Are the program goals and learning outcomes clear and explicit in regard to what students should be learning in the major?

4. Do the assessment results suggest that students are successfully attaining these outcomes?

5. Is there evidence that the program has reflected on these assessment results and engaged in curricular or other reforms in response to the results?

6. Would you want graduates of this program in your own graduate program?

7. Is the faculty quality and breadth of coverage adequate for a strong undergraduate program?

    a. Areas that should (must) be strengthened or added?
    b. Areas that should (must) be de-emphasized or removed?
    c. Where should the next appointment (resources permitting) be made?

8. In many fields, long-range planning and strategic choices about areas of teaching and research are necessary. Does the program provide an imaginative, workable long-range plan that will allow it to make major contributions to the discipline and to pursue appropriate specializations with distinction? If not, what do you suggest?

9. Where should the program focus its efforts to improve itself? What would be needed for this program (or some component) to achieve true national distinction giving due consideration to present UCR faculty resources compared to those available at top ranked programs elsewhere?

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

11. How do students and faculty feel about class size? How do they feel about the proportion of classes taught by TA's and lecturers/Associate Ins as opposed to regular faculty? How do students feel about grading standards and the response they get to written work for their classes?

12. Do the current administrative structures at UCR foster undergraduate education in the program you are reviewing? Are there closely related units at UCR or other UC campuses with which more collaboration should be undertaken? Are there appropriate support facilities such as libraries, teaching and research space, computer labs and training?

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

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

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

16. Is there any question we have not asked that you feel should be addressed?

We are aware that each program under review presents a special set of circumstances and that your review will need to take these distinctions into account. We intend these guidelines to be suggested topics that you may want to pursue rather than prescriptions of the process. As an External Reviewer, you should feel entirely free to pursue what avenues of investigation will yield constructive and relevant insights into the particular programs. We hope to obtain well thought-out and forthright judgments of where we stand in the academic picture, so that UCR may best capitalize on its strengths and take effective steps to correct weaknesses. The Academic Senate will give serious consideration to whatever directions you believe to be most worthwhile in achieving those ends.

Any questions concerning the review should be directed to the Subcommittee Chair and Senate staff analyst.

V. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

On the first day of the site visit, the review team meets with the VPDUE, and CEP Review Subcommittee. At this meeting, the CEP Subcommittee will give a briefing on procedures for the review and any other issues deemed necessary. The Review Team is asked to provide an assessment of the quality of faculty, students, and the program; areas of strength and weaknesses; advice on areas to remove or strengthen, adequacy of facilities, morale, and any other issues they wish to address. They are asked to furnish a written report of approximately 5-10 pages within two weeks of their visit. Following the meeting, the extramural review team meets with the Department/Program Chair followed by individual time with the faculty Undergraduate Advisor. After the initial briefings, the Review Team meets with the college Dean and appropriate Associate/Divisional Deans for student affairs. Next, the Review Team meets with the Chairs or other interested faculty of departments and programs of that are closely related, who teach prerequisites for the program, or whose programs include the program under review's courses in their curriculum. The program is responsible for setting up a tour of the facilities and meetings with the faculty of the program, which can be recorded or live video for remote reviews. For in-person reviews the program can host a reception for the review team after the last meeting of the first day. To assure a neutral review, CEP requests that all program faculty and staff be invited. Additionally, CEP recommends that the program make every effort possible to invite a random and representative sample of students to the reception. The reception is to be held on campus so that it is accessible to all invitees. No formal dinners should be planned with UCR contacts during the review. The team should be allowed to dine together and discuss preliminary findings.

The second half of the review includes program scheduled meetings with the Review Team and their staff advisors as well as the Career Center advisors applicable to the program. In addition, the program TA's, Lecturer's and lab staff (if applicable) should meet with the reviewers. A block of time should be allowed for selected students to meet with the reviewers. For in-person reviews, the lunch session on the second day is a closed session for the reviewers. The last meeting of the review is the exit interview when the External Review Team meets with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, VPDUE, the Dean, the Program Chair, and the CEP Subcommittee to give a discussion on their findings. The Chair of CEP Subcommittee leads the exit interview.

When the Review Team report is received, the honoraria are sent to the reviewers.

SAMPLE REVIEW TEAM SCHEDULE FOR IN-PERSON REVIEW
(Remote review schedules are configured over the course of four half days)

Day 1 External review team arrives at UCR		
8:00–8:30 am	External review team only	Senate conf. room
8:30-9:15 am	VPDUE & CEP Review Subcommittee	Senate conf. room
9:15-10:15 am	Program Chair	Senate conf. room
10:15–10:30 am	Break	
10:30-11:15 am	Faculty Undergraduate Advisor of Program	Senate conf. room
11:15 am–12:00 pm	Dean and Associate/Divisional Deans of the College or School	Senate conf. room
12:00–12:15 pm	Break	Senate conf. room
12:15-1:15 pm	Meet with faculty of closely related programs, particularly those who teach prerequisite courses for program, and those whose programs include the reviewed program's courses in their curriculum.	Senate conf. room
1:15–1:30 pm	CEP Subcommittee Member escorts reviewers to department for tour	
1:30-2:30 pm	Tour of Program's physical facilities including laboratories, classrooms, library.	
2:30-4:00 pm	Faculty of the program	Suggested: small group visits lasting one half hour in Program's conference room

4:00-5:00 pm	Selected students in the program	
Optional Program Reception for External Reviewers		
External Reviewers Return to Hotel		

Day 2 External Reviewers Arrive at UCR from Hotel		
8:30-9:00 am	Faculty of the program	Program conf. room
9:30-10:00 am	Selected students of the program	
10:00-10:45 am	Program staff advisors and Career Center	
10:45-11:30 am	TA's, Lecturers, and lab staff of the program	
11:30–11:45 am	Program escort reviewers to Academic Senate	
11:45 am -12:45 pm	Closed session lunch	Senate conf. room
12:45-2:15 pm	Faculty of the program	Program conf. room
2:15-2:45 pm	Program Chair	Program chair's office
2:45-3:00 pm	Break	
3:00-3:30 pm	Review Team only - Preparation of brief oral summary	Senate conf. room
3:30-4:15 pm	Exit Interview with Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, VPDUE, College Dean, CEP Subcommittee	Senate conf. room
4:15-5:00 pm	External Review Team Wrap Up	Senate conf. room
Review Team departs Riverside		

SUBMISSION OF EXTERNAL REPORT: The External Review Team will submit their report to the CEP Chair within two weeks. The External Review Team is advised that the report they submit will become a public record and as a result should be mindful with issues of confidentiality.

VI. Procedure on Findings and Recommendations

After the Review Team Report is received by the Chair of CEP, s/he shall distribute the report to the Subcommittee and the program Chair. The CEP Chair will ask the program to review the report for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions within a two-week time period. The program summary of any factual corrections and misperceptions will be relayed by the CEP Chair to the Subcommittee to aid in drafting the Findings and Recommendations.

The Subcommittee shall study the Team report and any factual corrections and misperceptions provided by the program and draft their Findings and Recommendations- a cohesive plan of action for improvement of the program. In developing their draft, the Subcommittee members shall integrate their understanding of the program with the new materials generated in the self-study and Team report. The Subcommittee will

recommend possible changes, if any, to improve the quality of the undergraduate program under review. If the draft Findings and Recommendations appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Subcommittee and CEP Chair may meet with the Chair and/or Undergraduate Advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document if the CEP Subcommittee thinks it would be helpful. On some occasions, the Subcommittee and CEP Chairs will seek to meet with the College Dean and a limited number of faculty members to discuss the draft Findings and Recommendations. Where the Findings and Recommendations do not appear to be controversial, the Subcommittee and CEP Chairs do not usually meet with the program Chair or other representatives. Copies of the preliminary Findings and Recommendations will be distributed to all members of the CEP, who may endorse the draft, approve the draft contingent to minor changes, or refer the draft back to the Subcommittee.

The CEP Chair will send the preliminary Findings and Recommendations to the program Chair for distribution to the program faculty, staff and students no later than three weeks after receipt of the program's "correction of facts" in the extramural report. The program shall seek and collect input from all constituents and prepare a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The program response is to be submitted to the CEP within two weeks of receiving the preliminary Findings and Recommendations.

The CEP review Subcommittee members will study the response from the program and within two weeks prepare the final Findings and Recommendations report. The Findings and Recommendations are a policy document, and failure by the program to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on undergraduate admissions or other actions. The CEP shall distribute its approved final report to the program for action along with copies of the External Review Team's Report, program's factual corrections to external report, preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report, and program's response to the preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report and to the respective college Dean and appropriate Associate Deans, the Academic Senate-Riverside Division Chair, VPDUE, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, and the Chancellor. Relevant portions of the report will be furnished to other Senate committees as needed. If CEP recommends the discontinuance of a program, they shall per the guidance in Appendix 7 submit a report to the Senate Chair including the review reports to request the discontinuance. If any findings or recommendations fall substantially outside the purview of the program (e.g., resource issues such as faculty lines, staffing, or facilities) these will be identified in the report and written responses will be requested from the relevant campus units (e.g. Dean or Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost). At this point the action implementation phase begins.

ACTION/IMPLEMENTATION: After the review, the CEP Chair, CEP review Subcommittee members, the VPDUE, the college Dean and/or Associate/Divisional Dean shall meet with program representatives to discuss the action steps to be taken as a result of the review. A timeline is set and resources needed to accomplish the plan's goals are identified and drafted in an implementation plan by the CEP Chair and sent to the program within two weeks of the meeting.

COMPLIANCE WITH IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: The CEP shall review the implementation plans of programs reviewed in the previous year. If the program was successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, the review is closed. If not, the review remains open and CEP may recommend follow-up actions to the program and appropriate campus administrators.

NOTIFICATION OF REVIEW STATUS: Upon completion of the action implementation phase the CEP Chair will send a memo to the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, VPDUE, college Dean, appropriate Associate/Divisional Deans, and Academic Senate-Riverside Division Chair notifying them of the status of the review. The CEP Chair will inform the recipients that supporting documentation for the reviews will be on file and stored in the Offices of the Academic Senate-Riverside Division. A brief summary of the programs reviewed and CEP actions are included in the CEP Annual Report to the Academic Senate-Riverside Division.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Undergraduate Program reviews will be treated with confidentiality until they are closed. The first reason for this confidentiality is to protect the program under review by ensuring it has a chance to respond to the Reviewer's report and correct error of fact and potential misconceptions before the report circulates. The second reason is to protect faculty governance of academic programs by ensuring that reviews are carried out in an atmosphere free of undue pressure from on or off campus. It is not appropriate to discuss a review in progress with anyone not normally a part of the process. However CEP may, at its discretion and in consultation with the program under review, share final documents before a review is closed with relevant campus units that demonstrate a compelling rationale for viewing the documents (e.g. accreditation reporting by the Office of Evaluation and Assessment).

Attachment A

Undergraduate Program Review
Student Satisfaction Survey

The undergraduate major in which you are enrolled is being reviewed by a team of faculty from other institutions and the Committee on Educational Policy. This survey is an essential part of the review process. Your feedback is important to help identify strengths and areas where improvement is needed for your major. Your responses will be confidential and no identifying information will be revealed.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact the Committee on Educational Policy Senate Analyst.

If the above major is not your major, please stop here!

Part A: Please answer each of the following questions.

1. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3= 3 years)

2. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a college other than a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3= 3 years; 4 = 4 or more years)

3. How many full years have you completed at UCR to date?

(N/A= 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3 = 3 years; 4 = 4 or more years)

4. Please answer the following questions with your level of satisfaction for the degree program you are enrolled in Poor; Below Average; Average; Above Average; Excellent)

Overall program;

Progress of degree completion;

Course availability;

Course content;

Fit of major with long term career objectives;

Interactions with academic advising staff (ie departmental offices or advising centers);

Interactions with faculty advisors (ie professors or Dean(s);

Enthusiasm for recommending degree program to others.

Part B: Use the space below to answer the following questions regarding your current major.

5. What do you like best about your major? (Open Comment)

6. What about your major is in greatest need of improvement? (Open Comment)

Attachment B

Undergraduate Program Review
Alumni Satisfaction Survey

The undergraduate major in which you recently graduated from at UCR is being reviewed by a team of faculty from other institutions and the Committee on Educational Policy. This survey is an essential part of the review process. Your feedback is important to help identify strengths and areas where improvement is needed in the major. Your responses will be confidential and no identifying information will be revealed.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact the Committee on Educational Policy Senate Analyst.

If you did not graduate with the above major, please stop here!

Part A: Please answer each of the following questions.

1. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3= 3 years)

2. How many years did you complete as a full time student in a college other than a community college before enrolling in UCR? (Round off to the closest number of full years.)

(N/A = 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3= 3 years; 4 = 4 or more years)

3. How many full years did you complete at UCR?

(N/A= 0 years; 1 = 1 year; 2 = 2 years; 3 = 3 years; 4 = 4 or more years)

4. Please answer the following questions with your level of satisfaction for the degree program you are enrolled in(Poor; Below Average; Average; Above Average; Excellent)

Overall satisfaction;

Rate of progress for completion of degree;

Course availability;

Course content;

Fit of degree to career objectives;

Academic advising staff (ie department offices or advising centers);

Faculty academic advising (ie professors or Dean(s));

Mentoring;

Level of enthusiasm for recommending degree program;

Did degree program provide knowledge and skills expected to achieve.

Part B: Use the space below to answer the following questions regarding your current major.

5. What did you like best about your major? (Open Comment)

6. What in your major was in the greatest need of improvement? (Open Comment)

Attachment C

Undergraduate Program Review
Faculty Survey

As you know, the undergraduate program in which you participate is being reviewed by a team of faculty from other institutions and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). As a faculty member in this department, you are invited to participate in the Faculty Survey. This survey is an essential part of the review process and consists of questions related to the quality and curriculum of the department. At the end of the survey you are invited to summarize your views or to elaborate on any aspect of the program you feel warrants more attention. Your constructive feedback is useful to the external review team and CEP in assessing the program.

Please note that only the external review team and CEP will have access to these comments.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact the CEP Senate Analyst.

Thank you for your participation.

1. What is your view of the overall quality of this undergraduate program?

   Excellent
   Good to very good
   Satisfactory
   Marginal
   Unsatisfactory

2. What is your view of the quality of the curriculum for this program?

   Excellent
   Good to very good
   Satisfactory
   Marginal
   Unsatisfactory

3. How favorably would you compare the quality of this program to equivalent programs at comparable universities?

   Better
   Equivalent
   Poor

4. Do you feel that the curriculum for this major needs changes?

No changes needed
Minor changes needed
Significant changes needed (please specify)

5. Do you feel that the curriculum for this program adequately covers the breadth of the discipline?

   Very well
   Fairly well
   Poorly

6. Do you feel that the curriculum for this program adequately covers the discipline in appropriate depth at the undergraduate level?

   Very well
   Fairly well
   Poorly

7. Do you feel that the level of course content in the courses designed for your majors is

   Appropriate for the quality of the students
   Too high
   Too low

8. The quality of undergraduate students in this major is generally

   High
   Satisfactory
   Low

9. Are courses required for the major offered frequently enough?

   Yes
   No

10. Does the undergraduate major depend heavily on courses provided by other departments or programs?

    Yes
    No

11. If yes to the previous question, are those courses satisfactory in content and instruction?

    Yes
    No

12. Do faculty in other programs participate in teaching courses in this program?

    Yes
    No

13. If yes, do those faculty participate in decisions concerning the content and scheduling of those courses?

    Yes
    No

14. Do you feel that the quality of instruction is strong for the courses required for the major?

    Very strong
    Strong
    Adequate
    Poor

15. Do you feel that the faculty members who teach in this major consider their teaching responsibilities as a high priority among their many responsibilities?

    High priority
    Moderate priority
    Low priority
    Poor

16. Do you feel that faculty efforts in undergraduate instruction are sufficiently rewarded in the merit and promotion process?

    Yes
    No

17. Do the majors have sufficient opportunities to be involved in enrichment experiences such as research?

    All students who seek such opportunities
    A reasonable fraction of students who seek such opportunities
    A small fraction of students who seek such opportunities

18. Are there good mechanisms in place to ensure that the majors are aware of enrichment opportunities such as research?

    Yes
    Outreach could be better

No

19. Undergraduate instructional space and facilities are

    Excellent
    Good
    Marginal
    Poor

20. Are students in the major advised properly?

    Excellent
    Satisfactory
    Poor

21. Who is primarily responsible for academic advising of the students in the major?

    The Undergraduate Advisor
    The Dean's office
    Individual faculty
    Staff

22. What is the most frequent cause of student dropout from the major?

    Dissatisfaction with the major
    Unsatisfactory performance of the student
    Lack of opportunities in that discipline after graduation
    Other

23. Does the Department/Program formally assist students in placements, either for job or professional programs?

    Excellent placement program
    Poor placement program
    No placement program, but individual faculty assist students
    No placement program

24. How are the job prospects for students who graduate from the major?

    Excellent
    Very good
    Good
    Marginal
    Poor

25. My undergraduate instruction load is

    About right
    Too heavy
    Too light

26. Is the total number of faculty sufficient for maintaining a high quality major?

    Yes
    Marginal
    No

27. How do you evaluate faculty morale in your major with respect to the Department or Program, not with respect to the university?

    Excellent
    Good
    Poor

28. "Administrators are adequately supportive of this program." My perception of this statement is:

    True
    False

29. If you would like to explain any of your ratings for the above questions, please do so here: (open comment)

30. What are your perceived strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program? (open comment)

31. Are there any other issues the review team should be aware of? (open comment)

Attachment D

Faculty Biography Summary Template Form

Please use the following template to provide a summary of each faculty's biography for the Faculty Data section of the self-study. Please note that this template may be altered to suit the needs of each program, but should be limited to 2 to 3 pages and uniformly adopted for the whole program (i.e., all faculty members in a program under review should use exactly the same form).

Department of _____ (or Program in _____) Faculty Information Summary

Name:

Position Title:

Year and Rank of Appointment at UCR:

Joint or Collaborating Appointments in Other Programs, Departments, or Centers:

Highest Degree Earned, Institution, Year Earned:

Postdoctoral Training:

Areas of Research Specialization:

Total Number of Peer-Reviewed Publications:

Five Most Important Peer-Reviewed Publications:

Selected Awards and Honors during the Past Ten Years:

Administrative Positions and Selected Major Committee/Service Work during the Past Ten Years, Including Dates of Service:

Undergraduate Courses Taught During the Past 3 Years:

Undergraduate Thesis Supervision During the Past 3 Years:

Grants that Impact the Undergraduate Program Including Undergraduate Research:

Title of Granting Agency	**Total Award (Direct Cost)**	**Number of Undergraduate Students Supported Through this Grant (If Applicable)**

Attachment E

WASC Core Competencies

In 2013 the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) defined a set of five core competencies that an institution is expected to demonstrate in terms of the assessment of student learning and achievement. These are:

- Written communication
- Quantitative reasoning
- Oral communication
- Information literacy
- Critical thinking

An extended definition of each of these can be found on the Evaluation and Assessment page of the UCR Undergraduate Education web pages which can be found at:

http://ueeval.ucr.edu/assessment/core_competencies_2.html

The annual learning assessment reports submitted by the program should already include descriptions of the metrics used by the program for its internal assessment and the results of their application. These may be used as a source for the material needed for the self-study.

Appendix A

Procedures for Internal Reviews of Undergraduate Programs

CEP may conduct internal reviews on programs to assess the progress of an undergraduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review, to evaluate the progress of new undergraduate programs, or to evaluate a small program with a small enrollment of students including minors that are not part of a program that offers a major. Internal reviews will be an abbreviated version of a routine external review that can be targeted to problematic issues.

1. CEP will inform the program of the decision to have an internal review and provide a reason for the internal review in the preceding academic year.

2. A CEP subcommittee will be formed to include at least two members to conduct the internal review.

3. The CEP subcommittee shall become familiar with the most recent previous review and outstanding issues. Members will read the previous external review reports. The subcommittee will also schedule a one-day review meeting and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted to the remaining issues or unique nature of the program that necessitated an internal review.

   The following information may be collected and evaluated by the CEP Subcommittee prior to the review meeting (not all of these data may be necessary, depending on the circumstances and timing of the internal review):

   - A statement concerning the program's vision (program self study report). This statement should include the program's strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies, progress from past reviews (if applicable), long range goals, and enrollment plans.

   - Up to date biosketches for all program faculty.

   - Program material that is distributed to students and structure of degrees.

   - A brief statement outlining how undergraduate student advising is conducted.

   - Results from faculty and student satisfaction surveys (CEP will conduct these surveys and hold the results confidential)

   - Student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research to CEP.

After the evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair of the program to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to planning for the future. The subcommittee should also meet with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and College Dean. If the subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional meetings with program faculty and/or students.

4. The Subcommittee is responsible for drafting a preliminary Findings and Recommendations report that will follow the same procedures as required for an external review report. The report should include the reason for the internal review. The remainder of the reporting process and action implementation process are to be followed as descripted in the procedures for external reviews.

Appendix B

Implementation of ABET-CEP Merger of BCOE Undergraduate Program Review Riverside Division of the Academic Senate (Revised 03/06/26)

On March 16, 2011, CEP approved the merging of BCOE's ABET accreditation and CEP's undergraduate program review. The justification for this action is a desire to reduce the workload of the departments under review and CEP by substituting the ABET review for CEP's external review. After a comparison of the two review processes, CEP determined that ABET's review is very thorough even though there are differences in the review criteria and process. It was felt that these differences in principle are relatively minor and can be addressed internally by CEP's subcommittees tasked with conducting the reviews. To be relevant, CEP's reviews must be coordinated with the release of ABET's final report. The procedure for BCOE's undergraduate program review will be as follows:

1. CEP requests BCoE to send the final ABET report to CEP for review planning purposes.

2. CEP will notify BCoE undergraduate programs of upcoming reviews and request the self-studies submitted for the ABET report during the academic year prior to the scheduled review.

3. CEP subcommittees will be established for the review of each undergraduate program and faculty, student and alumni satisfaction surveys will be conducted in accordance with CEP's Undergraduate Program Procedures will be facilitated by the Academic Senate. The results of these surveys will serve to supplement the ABET report and will be held confidential. Only the CEP review subcommittees will have access to the results.

4. The subcommittees will review ABET's final report, the self-study and the program's response to the ABET report. During the review, the subcommittee may amend the review if necessary. For example, an amendment could request additional information from the program or solicit a supplemental external evaluation.

5. Once the terms of the review and any amendments are completed, the subcommittees will prepare a draft Findings and Recommendations document. This document will be forwarded to the program by the end of the academic year, though in most cases it will be sent much earlier. From this point on, the review process is identical to that of a regular external review.

6. Undergraduate programs that are not part of the ABET review process will undergo a regular external review at a time that is not necessarily tied to the ABET accreditation.