GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

What follows here is an explanation of practical matters not fully covered in the Appendices, especially those related to the formation of review subcommittees and their duties.

A. Composition of Review Subcommittees

Each Council member is appointed to serve with at least one other member on one (sometimes two) graduate program review subcommittee(s) for each year of his/her service on Graduate Council. Over the course of a normal three-year appointment to Council, each member will serve on at least three reviews. Those who serve as Chair and Vice-Chair of Council may serve on a larger number of review subcommittees. At the beginning of each academic year, it is the duty of the Council Chair to determine the membership of each review subcommittee.

B. Responsibilities of Council Members

Each graduate review subcommittee is thus comprised of at least two (one or more "regular" members and a subcommittee Chair). These members share the following duties:

- Review for completeness and accuracy the assembled review materials compiled through a joint effort of faculty and staff from the program under review and the Graduate Council Staff analyst. Typically, the review subcommittee will review the program's self-study report and provide feedback and recommendations for improvement prior to sending materials to the extramural review team members. The Chair of the review subcommittee will call a meeting of the review subcommittee to discuss the finalized materials just before the review. For a complete overview and listing of the materials included, please see **Appendix 3.**

- Participate in two meetings with the extramural review team members while they are visiting campus or by Zoom. The first of these meetings is held at the beginning of the first day of the review team's visit, and the second at the end of the second day. This is the "exit interview", when the deans and Provost are present, and the extramural review team members provide a preliminary overview of their findings.

- Read the extramural team's final report when it becomes available (typically two to three weeks following the review), and any first-round "corrections of fact" in relationship to the report provided by the program faculty.

- Prepare a draft **Findings and Recommendations (F&R)** document that summarizes the major findings of the review and specifies any actions that Graduate Council deems necessary (Guidelines for Writing Findings and Recommendations is attached as **Appendix 5**). The Findings and Recommendations document should be prepared in a timely fashion, no later than two to three weeks following receipt of the extramural review team's report and the corrections of fact from the program.

- Present the draft **Findings and Recommendations** document at the next regularly scheduled meeting of Graduate Council and make any suggested revisions resulting from discussion with full Council membership. Within one week's time, the final version of the **Findings and Recommendations** document should be forwarded to the Council Analyst who then sends it to the program as a "working document." (See more on this step in **Appendix 3** below.)

- Read the response of the program (due within one month after their receipt of the **Findings and Recommendations**) and conduct any follow-up business associated with closing out the review. This may include many of the following actions: negotiate with the program

leadership regarding any disagreements with the F&R document; establish a firm timeline for the completion of any outstanding matters in the F&R document; make a recommendation to the Council Chair about timing for closing (completing) the review.

C. Closing Program Reviews in Timely Fashion

An important issue for Graduate Council is the timely completion and closing of graduate program reviews. There is much potential for slowdowns along the way when deadlines are not met. **Graduate Council members must do their utmost to conform to the schedule presented above (also, for a timeline in table form for external reviews, see Appendix 5, *Guidelines for Writing Findings and Recommendations*).** The Senate staff analyst assigned to Graduate Council will keep everyone on track. The goal is to finish as many reviews as possible within the time frame of one academic year. Programs with outstanding program review responses are advised that Graduate Council may not review curriculum changes submitted for the Council's approval until the outstanding program review response is received.

D. Internal Reviews and Special Actions

The Graduate Council may conduct internal reviews to evaluate graduate programs as circumstances warrant. For example, an internal review may be recommended to assess the progress of a graduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review or to evaluate the progress of new graduate programs (three to five years after initiation of the program). Depending on the particular situation, the information necessary for the review may vary. **Please consult Appendix 4** for full details on internal review procedures, and on subsequent special actions that may be taken in the case of unfavorable graduate program reviews.

APPENDIX 3

GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES
University of California, Riverside

I. Overview

Routine reviews of graduate programs are conducted by the Graduate Council with the aid of extramural review teams. The process has the approval of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The primary aim of the review process is to help improve graduate programs or, if necessary, to close programs found to be undesirably weak.

The Graduate Council determines the sequence and schedule of reviews. The sequence of upcoming reviews is discussed at least annually and can be altered by action of the Council. Normally, seven or more programs are scheduled for review each year. This pattern typically yields a 7-10-year cycle between reviews.

External and/or internal graduate program reviews are subject to be conducted remotely at the program's discretion or when circumstances are present that do not allow for in-person gatherings. A decision to conduct a review remotely will be made by the Graduate Council or the program being reviewed.

II. Preparation for Council Review

The graduate program is notified at least 12 months prior to the scheduled review and asked to confirm and take a faculty vote on their upcoming review's modality. Program requests to postpone reviews will be considered on a case-by-case basis by Graduate Council. In the spring preceding the academic year of the review, the program is asked to prepare the following information regarding its program for submission to the Graduate Council and to outside reviewers.

1. Self-Study Report – The Self-Study Report should be a concise document detailing the program's strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since the last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the reviewing team or the Graduate Council. The report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. Thus, your own presentation of your program will be available to everyone who receives the review report and recommendations. The report should be five to fifteen single-spaced pages depending on the size and complexity of the program. Summary tables and graphs should be included where appropriate.
2. Faculty List - List of faculty must include faculty names, department (for interdepartmental programs), title, and email address.
3. List of Faculty by Rank – List of faculty must include department affiliation and participation in other graduate programs.
4. Ph.D. Placement Data (or Masters data if masters only program) – Placement data for all Ph.D. degrees awarded since the program's last review is provided by the Graduate Division and must be confirmed by the program. The table includes the students name, graduation date, dissertation Chair, first position, current position, and current email address.
5. Digested Faculty Biographies - Brief biographies for faculty members.

6. Program Material Distributed to Students - A page listing links to website materials available to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).
7. Faculty Grant Activity Summary – a summary of your faculty grant data. The Senate Graduate Council Analyst will provide you with a template to self-report grants awarded since the program's last review.

The Graduate Council gathers statistical information from sources around the campus. The Office of Institutional Research provides:

1. Departmental budget and expenditures.
2. Faculty (ladder and budgeted) FTE and Staff Personnel FTE as of Fall (current year).
3. All courses taught by ladder Instructor (since the last program review).
4. All course enrollments – Cross-Listed Included (since the last program review).
5. Student workload FTE and faculty FTE adjusted (since the last program review).
6. General Campus Headcount Enrollment by Student Major (since the last program review).
7. Summary of financial support provided to all graduate students (since the last program review).
8. Admissions profiles, applicant data, enrollment data, degrees awarded (since the last program review), and dropout rate.

The Graduate Division provides:

9. PhD Placement Data (or Master's data if Master's only program, and if available)
10. UCR Doctoral Exit Survey data, if applicable
11. Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

The program should summarize the data to make it most useful for the external review team and Graduate Council. Grant data should be summarized with charts, tables or graphs and discussed in the Self-Study Report. Items 1-11 are sent to the program before dissemination to anyone else so that any differences concerning the statistics can be resolved.

A confidential questionnaire dealing with academic program quality matters including space for written comments is sent to each faculty member. A separate confidential questionnaire is sent to current graduate students and Ph.D. awardees since the last review (master's awardees in the case of a master's only program). Statistical summaries are provided where appropriate, and a compilation of all comments, copied verbatim, is included in the review materials. These questionnaire responses are only seen by the review team and members of the Graduate Council review subcommittee. They are to be kept confidential and responses are *never* shared with members of the program or campus administrators.

III. Composition of Extramural Review Team

When first notified of the pending review, the program is asked to provide a ranked list of distinguished, **neutral** reviewers as shown in the following excerpts from a letter of request:

> An extramural team will be used to assist in the review. Please provide Sarah Miller (sarah.miller@ucr.edu) with a list of at least 15 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other campuses of the UC and the rest from other places throughout the U.S. Because we will use a three-member review panel, please divide your list of names into three topical areas corresponding to the organization of your program. It is important to

have one UC reviewer who can advise the others of what is possible within the UC and of how the University works. However, no topical area grouping should include more than three names of UC faculty. *The names of potential reviewers should be solicited from your **entire** faculty, and the list should be approved by the faculty, in part to assure that there are no conflicts of interest.*

The Graduate Council would also like to ask that your program rank the list of reviewers based on the selection criteria of their academic, teaching, advising and administrative experience for graduate programs and any other additional information the program may have on the potential reviewers' qualifications and the likelihood that they will be a productive member of the review team. Experience with running or advising similar graduate programs, the reviewer's stature as a researcher in the field, and their ability to provide objective and critical reviews of programs should also be taken into consideration. Each of the three areas of your list should be ranked so that three highly ranked reviewers can be selected to review your program. Your rankings will assist the Graduate Council in selecting members for your review team.

The Graduate Council asks to be *assured in writing that the proposed extramural reviewers can carry out a neutral review*. The Council is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty and potential reviewers: (1) personal friendships; (2) reviewer and UCR faculty member have been in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) cooperative research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these relationships applies to a potential reviewer, the individual should be eliminated, or the Graduate Council should be informed of the facts of the relationship.

The Graduate Council review subcommittee Chair (or an appropriate member of the Graduate Council) vets the lists of suggested reviewers and either agrees with the rankings or makes revisions. If other names arise from these queries, they are sent to the program for comment. The Graduate Council Analyst contacts and assembles the review team members and coordinates their travel arrangements. Team members receive reimbursement for travel expenses and a $1,000 honorarium.

The Graduate Council provides a 'standard' set of topics that the Extramural Team may (not "must") use to guide its deliberations; most of the topics are used for all programs, but some are program specific. The program examines the list of topics before they are sent to the Extramural Team.

About thirty days ahead of the scheduled visit, the information above is sent to each member of the extramural review team (contents of package follow below). Identical information is provided to the members of the Graduate Council review subcommittee. The program, College Dean, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor receive the same information except for the questionnaire responses which are not forwarded for purposes of student/faculty confidentiality. The questionnaires are destroyed after the site visit and are only seen by the external review team and Graduate Council review subcommittee responsible for the review.

The following items are included in packets sent to extramural review team members:

1. Program Review schedule

2. Set of general topics for reviewers
3. Program self-study report
4. Materials available to graduate students
5. A list of faculty members by rank and digested biographies (Brief Bio-Sketch)
6. Graduate student placement data for Ph.D. recipients (or Masters students if available)
7. Annual Assessment Reports/Learning Outcomes
8. Confidential Questionnaires (former students, current faculty, current students)
9. Faculty Grant Data
10. Admission data (Admissions profiles, applicant data, enrollment data, degrees awarded and time to degree, dropout rate, and UCR Doctoral Exit Survey data)
11. Graduate student support data, courses taught, enrollments, student workload, number of majors
12. Departmental budget and expenditure data
13. Ladder rank faculty FTE and staff FTE
14. Program Self-Study and Vision from previous review (if applicable)
15. Post-review documents (reviewers report, Graduate Council's Findings & Recommendations, program's responses, etc.) from previous review (if applicable)

***No other materials may be provided to the review team other than the materials that are vetted by the Graduate Council and included in the final review materials.**

IV. Extramural Review Team Review and Report

The reviewers are 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 participate in an exit interview and to furnish a written report of 10-15 pages within two weeks of the completion of the review.

A typical review begins at 8:30-9am with a briefing by the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. The briefing includes discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the program being reviewed and any particular areas of concern. The review team then meets with the Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies and then separately with the relevant College/School Dean. Following the morning meetings, the Team meets to organize itself and then meets the program chair and graduate advisor(s), after which the Team begins to meet with faculty and students in the program. Students must be given the opportunity to meet with the review team without faculty present. Around noon (in-person) or first thing in the morning on the second day (remote), the Team usually meets with chairs/directors of closely related programs. These chairs are chosen by the Chair of the program being reviewed. After this meeting, the team moves to the program offices and meets with faculty/students and examines the physical facilities. For virtual reviews, recordings or live video of facilities can be provided to the review team. For in-person reviews, the afternoon of the first day (after 4:30pm) is reserved for an optional department/program hosted reception. The reception must be on campus and graduate students must be invited to the event. Graduate students should have the same amount of access to the reviewers that the faculty have.

The second day of the review (& the days that may follow if remote review) continues with more interviews with faculty and students. In-person reviewers will have a working lunch on this day. The last activity is the exit interview which is the last meeting of the review and includes the review team, the College or School Dean(s), Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies &/or Associate Dean(s), Provost, and Graduate Council review subcommittee members to discuss the review team's findings. In this meeting Team members usually present their findings, followed by free questioning by Graduate Council review subcommittee members and members of the

administration. Sometimes the whole session is devoted solely to question-and-answer. The Graduate Council review subcommittee chair leads this exit interview.

When the Team report is received, honoraria are distributed. The Team report is reviewed by the Graduate Council review subcommittee for matters of confidentiality, and the report (redacted if necessary) is sent to the Program with a two-week response deadline for preliminary comment about factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. **The reviewers' report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.**

V. Graduate Council *Findings and Recommendations*

The Graduate Council review subcommittee integrates its knowledge of the history and status of each program, together with the information and material generated by the program during the review process (including the extramural team report), to formulate a draft of the ***Findings and Recommendations*** -- a cohesive plan of action for improvement of the program. The first draft is written by the Graduate Council review subcommittee assigned to the review. If the draft *Findings and Recommendations* appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Graduate Council review subcommittee *may* choose to meet with the chair and/or graduate advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document. On occasion, the Graduate Council review subcommittee has met with the college dean and limited numbers of faculty members to discuss the *Findings and Recommendations*. Where the *Findings and Recommendations* appear to be non-controversial, the Graduate Council review subcommittee does not usually meet with program chairs or other representatives. When the Graduate Council review subcommittee has prepared a draft set of *Findings and Recommendations*, the document is discussed at a full meeting of the Graduate Council for its approval. For its consideration of the draft *Findings and Recommendations*, the Council is provided with copies of the extramural team report and the program's preliminary response to the extramural team report. Not usually sent to all individuals on the Council, but available to members upon request, are all other data available to the Graduate Council review subcommittee. If substantial problems are anticipated, arrangements are made to have all members of the Council become familiar with the entire data set. When a draft acceptable to the Council is achieved, it is sent to the program as a working document with a request for a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The program's response to the Council's *Findings and Recommendations* is due within 30 days of receipt, unless the document is received late in the Spring quarter, at which point the program's response is due the following Fall quarter. The *Findings and Recommendations* is a policy document, and failure to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on graduate admissions or other actions. Programs with outstanding program review responses are advised that Graduate Council may not review curriculum changes submitted for the Council's approval until the outstanding program review response is received.

Escalation Chart for Non-Responsive Programs

1st Notice	Academic Senate Graduate Council Analyst
2nd Notice – reminder	Academic Senate Graduate Council Analyst
3rd Notice	Graduate Council Chair/Vice Chair
4th Notice	Academic Senate Director
5th Notice	Academic Senate Chair
6th Notice - FINAL	Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost

When the Graduate Council is satisfied that changes are being implemented by the program as suggested by the *Findings and Recommendations*, Graduate Council will close the review and provide the program with a letter so stating.

Copies of the unedited extramural team report, the program preliminary response, the Graduate Council *Findings and Recommendations*, and program final response are sent to the Chancellor, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor, College or School Dean, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies, and Academic Senate Chair. A brief summary of the programs reviewed, and Graduate Council actions are included in the Graduate Council Annual Report to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

The review of the master's level programs follows the same format, but the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee may play the role of the extramural team at the option of the Council.

Graduate programs may be asked to provide Graduate Council with a progress report 3 to 4 years after a review has been closed.

VI. Summary of Confidentiality

Graduate Program Reviews are treated as confidential until officially closed for two reasons. First, confidentiality protects the program under review by ensuring that the program has a chance to respond to the extramural team report and correct errors of fact and potential misconceptions before it circulates. Second, confidentiality protects faculty governance of academic programs by ensuring that reviews are carried out in an atmosphere free of undue pressure from on or off campus.

After Graduate Council has completed and officially closed a review, it shall be normal practice to forward to the Chancellor, Provost, College Dean(s), Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Senate Chair the following materials: the unedited extramural team report, any and all written responses from the program under review, the final version of Council's Findings and Recommendations, and associated correspondence accumulated in the course of the review. Ordinarily, other materials compiled for the review (the program's compiled review materials) will not be forwarded to administrators unless specifically requested. **Under no circumstances will the questionnaire responses (from program faculty and students) be made available to anyone other than members of Graduate Council and the extramural review team.** Likewise, upon request and for good reason, other UCR faculty members may request access to the same materials made available to administrators upon completion of a graduate program review.

APPENDIX 4

Procedures for Internal Reviews of Graduate Programs

A. Internal Review to monitor unfavorable or changing conditions for a graduate program
Graduate Council may mandate an internal review when an external review has been problematic or when circumstances are changing dramatically for a program. This review will be an abbreviated version of a routine external review, targeted to the problematic issues.

1. Information to Program Chair and Deans. The Graduate Council Chair will prepare a letter to the Program Chair, college Dean, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor informing them of the decision to have an internal review and provide reasons and suggested timing.

2. Internal Review Team. Each internal review team shall have at least two members (a minimum of one regular Graduate Council member as well as a review subcommittee Chair).

3. Internal Review Activities. The internal review team shall become familiar with the most recent previous review and outstanding issues. Members will read the previous extramural review report, all responses from the program, college Dean, and others. The team will schedule a one-day review meeting (without external consultants) and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted to the remaining problematic issues.

The following information may be collected and evaluated by the internal review team prior to the review meeting (please note 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 –
    a. Self-assessment of the program status – include strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies which might exist.
    b. Progress on response to issues raised in the findings and recommendations from the external review.
    c. Long range goals.
    d. Graduate student recruitment plans.
- Up-to-date biosketches for all faculty members.
- Departmental material distributed to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).
- A brief statement outlining how graduate student advising is conducted.

- Confidential questionnaires sent to faculty and students currently enrolled in program.

- Graduate student support data for last three years (Office of Institutional Research).

- Admissions data - GPAs, undergraduate institutions, GRE scores, degree objective (Office of Institutional Research).

After evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair/Director of the program and Graduate Advisor to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to planning for the future. The Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies and relevant College/School Dean should also be interviewed. If the subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional interviews with faculty and/or students.

4. Draft Findings and Recommendations. The internal review team is responsible for a draft *Findings and Recommendations* that will follow the same procedures as required for a regular review report. The report should explain why an internal review was recommended and what was accomplished since the last review; identify what remains to be done to address recommendations of the review and how it will be accomplished; and suggest the year for the next review. **The report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.** The Graduate Council Chair's letter to the program Chair and college Dean should be included in the attachments. The internal review report will be provided to the external review team at the time of the next regular review.

5. End of Review. At the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting after the internal review report becomes available, the Graduate Council will consider the Findings and Recommendations from the internal review team. The voting will be handled exactly as it is for programs closed immediately after a satisfactory response to the Findings and Recommendations.

6. Close of Review. When the internal review team decides sufficient progress has been made and recommends that Graduate Council close the review, Graduate Council shall confirm the recommendation to close the internal review and set the date for the next review (normally 5-7 years after the last external review). At this time, they shall also write a memo to the program informing them that the review is closed and describing any further actions that Graduate Council recommends the program take prior to the next review. This letter will be provided to the review team at the time of the next review.

B. Internal Review Procedures for Reviews of New Graduate Programs (3rd year)
Graduate Council will conduct an internal review of all new graduate programs three to five years after the initiation of the program to evaluate the progress. This Internal Review will be an abbreviated version of an extramural review, targeted at the program's progress and plans for the future of the graduate program.

1. Information to Program Chair and Deans. The Graduate Council Chair will prepare a letter to the Program Chair/Director, College/School Dean, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate

Studies, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor informing them of the decision to have an internal review and provide the following information: a) reason for the review – routine internal review of new program; b) what needs to be done, by whom, in order to conduct the review; and c) target date for closing the review.

2. Internal Review Team. Each internal review team shall have at least two members (a minimum of one regular Graduate Council member, as well as a review subcommittee Chair). It is up to the internal review team to monitor progress and decide when sufficient progress has been made to recommend an end to the review.

3. Internal Review Activities. The internal review team shall become familiar with the review materials provided by the program. The team will participate in a one-day meeting (without external consultants) and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted at the program's progress and plans for the future of the graduate program.

The following information will be collected three years after initiation of the program and evaluated by the internal review team:

- A 3-5 page statement concerning the program's vision (Program Self-Study Report). This statement should include–
    a. Self-assessment of the progress of the program to date -- include strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies which might exist.
    b. Long range goals.
    c. Graduate student recruitment plans.
    d. Plans for interactions with other campus units.
- Up-to-date bio-sketches for all faculty members.
- Departmental material distributed to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).
- A brief statement outlining how graduate student advising is conducted.
- Confidential questionnaires sent to faculty and students currently enrolled in program.
- Graduate student support data for last three years (Office of Institutional Research).
- Admissions data - GPAs, undergraduate institutions, GRE scores, degree objective (Office of Institutional Research).

After evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair/Director of the program and Graduate Advisor(s) to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to

planning for the future. The Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies and relevant College/School Dean should also be interviewed. If the subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional interviews with faculty and/or students.

4. Draft Findings and Recommendations. The internal review team shall be responsible for a draft *Findings and Recommendations* that will follow the same procedures as required for a regular review report and will serve as the basis for the Graduate Council consideration for ending the review. The report should explain what was accomplished during the review, identify what remains to be done to address recommendations of the review and how it will be accomplished, and suggest the year for the next review. **The report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.** The Graduate Council Chair's letter to the program Chair and college Dean should be included in the attachments. The internal review report will be provided to the review team at the time of the next regular review.

5. End of Review. At the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting after the internal review report becomes available, the Graduate Council will consider the Findings and Recommendations from the internal review team. The internal review team Chair shall be responsible for finalizing the final Findings and Recommendations.

6. Close of Review. When the internal review team decides sufficient progress has been made and recommends that Graduate Council close the review, Graduate Council shall confirm the recommendation to close the internal review and set the date for the next review (normally 5 to 7 years after the current review). At this time, they shall also write a memo to the program informing them that the review is closed and describing any further actions that Graduate Council recommends the program take prior to their next review. This letter will be provided to the review team at the time of the next review.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

C. Early Review

On rare occasions, when compelling need has been demonstrated, Graduate Council may decide to review a program earlier than scheduled. The request to consider an early review may be initiated by either Graduate Council or by students, faculty members, or administrators directly associated with the program. The Graduate Council will decide whether there is cause for considering the request. If so, they will carry out preliminary fact finding to decide whether to grant the request. It is expected that requests for early reviews will be made infrequently.

D. Reviews of Programs also being reviewed by Accreditation Teams

The reviews of programs that are also reviewed by accreditation teams should, as much as possible, be coordinated with the accreditation evaluation, assuming the program wishes such coordination. In scheduling the year of the next review, consideration may also be given to evening out the number of reviews conducted by the Graduate Council in a given year.

E. Suspension of Admissions ("Moratorium")

The suspension of admissions to a graduate program is also called a "moratorium." Cause for imposing a moratorium includes, but is not limited to, a program's failure to fulfill its teaching or research mission; disregard for student and/or faculty welfare; and/or the inability to deliver its

programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts. Graduate Council can also impose a moratorium on a graduate program for failure to respond to or comply with Council's Findings and Recommendations resulting from a graduate program review (internal or extramural). A moratorium initiated by Graduate Council may also be cause for the recommendation of academic receivership.

F. Receivership

Academic receivership is defined as the appointment of an individual external to the unit who will be vested with sufficient administrative authority to oversee implementation of the recommendations of the Graduate Council. The appointment of a receiver falls under the purview of the relevant Dean or Provost. The receiver may be appointed Chair or may be charged to work closely with the Chair as a temporary administrative adjunct. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations issued at the close of program reviews may include a recommendation to the relevant administrator that a unit be placed in academic receivership. Cause for the recommendation for receivership includes, but is not limited to cases where an academic unit is unable or unwilling to govern itself in accordance with the principles of shared governance; where it is in noncompliance with the Academic Senate's Program Review process; where it is failing to fulfill its teaching or research mission; where disregard for student and faculty welfare is evident; or where the inability to deliver its programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts is in evidence. In each case, the recommendation for receivership will be accompanied by a recommendation for an early review.

G. Appendix 7 Actions

Should the unit under review prove to be unwilling, unable, or incapable of adequately addressing the issues that led to a suspension of admissions and/or a recommendation for receivership, the Graduate Council may initiate any of the actions as stipulated in Appendix 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate (UC Riverside Procedures for Discontinuance of a Program).