Academic Program Review

UCSF Graduate Council and Graduate Division

May 2014

Table of Contents

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

UCSF Graduate Programs are recognized as some of the best in the world, and are critical to the UCSF mission. Periodic Graduate Program reviews ensure continued program quality in a rapidly changing scientific and academic world. Reviews are meant to encourage active and continuing self-examination, as well as providing impartial feedback on program success and the role of each program in the larger context of the UCSF mission. Reviews can also provide a means of identifying programs whose expansion would benefit the UCSF mission. A successful program review should integrate faculty and student input with the external review to the benefit of the program and the UCSF community at large.

I. Schedule of Academic Program Review

Program Reviews are scheduled as follows:

PhD programs with T32 Grants: Programs with NIH-funded Ruth L. Kirschstein NRSA Institutional Training Grants (hereafter, T32 grants) may opt in or out of the Graduate Council program review. Programs with T32 grants must apply for competitive renewal of those awards every 5 years. These applications consist of a rigorous self-study, the aggregation and analysis of student data (demographics, outcomes), and external evaluation by a committee of peer reviewers. Thus, the quinquennial T32 renewal follows the same processes and achieves the same goals as an external program review organized by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Graduate Council.

Graduate program directors will notify the Graduate Dean of their plan of action. Programs that choose to opt in may choose to undergo the formal external review process up to two years before they begin to work on their T32 renewal (with the goal of incorporating the external reviewers' report and the program's response into the T32 renewal application) OR they may choose to undergo a more informal internal review process. This internal review would convene UCSF faculty from outside the program to engage in critical assessment of the graduate program and would be organized by the Graduate Division. In both cases, the program director will work with the Graduate Dean's office to develop a meaningful set of questions to guide the review effort.

PhD and other doctorate programs without T32 grants: Programs without T32 grants will undergo external program reviews every 8 years according to the attached schedule (Appendix I). These reviews will convene 3-4 faculty in the discipline from peer institutions and will be organized by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Graduate Council. Prior to the initial review, the program director will work with the Graduate Dean's office to develop a meaningful set of questions to guide both the self-study and the external review report.

Master's programs: The one-year master's programs will undergo external program reviews every 5 years. The two- and three-year master's programs will be reviewed

every 8 years. These external reviews will be conducted in the same manner as described above for the social and population sciences PhD programs. [Note: The nursing master's and MEPN programs are externally reviewed by the state and national accreditation bodies.]

II.   Selection of the External Review Committee

The External Review Committee generally consists of three to five highly qualified individuals who are not affiliated with the campus or the program. It is usually not appropriate to appoint former faculty members, alumni, or research collaborators. Criteria for committee selection include a history of involvement and success in scholarship, research, and/or teaching in the specific field. In fields where technical expertise is required, a representative from industry may be included.

The graduate program submits a list of potential reviewers to the Graduate Dean. The Dean and the Graduate Council review the names, provide additional recommendations, and also solicit recommendations from the names submitted by the program. The goal is to appoint a diverse team of reviewers, who represent both public and private institutions. The Graduate Dean is responsible for inviting the reviewers, finalizing the review committee, and selecting the chair of the committee.

Travel expenses and honoraria are provided by the Program. The program will set the amount of the honoraria for the external committee members and chair.

A Graduate Council member is appointed by the Council Chair to serve as a liaison to the review committee. The liaison attends all sessions of the site visit, serves as a campus resource throughout the visit, and debriefs the Council on various aspects of the review process.

III.   Program Self-Study

At least six months prior to the campus site visit, the program begins their self-study. Guidelines for this study are contained in the section titled **Academic Program Review: Preparing the Self-Study**. In general, the study includes information on the curriculum, teaching, research, faculty, students, postdocs, resources, and future direction of the program. The process includes a significant amount of planning, data collection, analysis, and writing. The self-study is forwarded to the Graduate Division approximately three weeks prior to the review. The program then sends the self-study to the External Review Committee two weeks before the scheduled site visit.

IV.   Graduate Student Survey

An important element of the review is the anonymous, on-line, Graduate Student Survey conducted by the Graduate Division. Approximately two months prior to the review, students in the program are contacted by e-mail and asked to complete the survey through a survey software mechanism (i.e. Qualtrics). Results are collected and analyzed by the Graduate Division and presented to the External Review Committee during their visit. A summary of this information is later shared with the Graduate Council and the graduate program, with the assurance that individual student responses are not identifiable.

V.   Information Provided to External Review Committee

Approximately two weeks prior to the review, the Graduate Division sends the External Review Committee a charge letter, the program self-study, the "**Academic Review: Guidelines for External Report**," and the site visit agenda. The charge letter summarizes the purpose of the review and specific content areas that need to be addressed.

VI.   Campus Site Visit

The one- or two-day campus site visit includes meetings with the Program Director and department chair(s), program faculty, students, postdocs, the School Dean, the Graduate Dean, and the Associate Provost. Time is set aside for the review committee to meet privately on the first (and if applicable, second) day. One session will include the review of the previous External Review Report. A working dinner is held at the end of the first day of the review, which includes the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council Liaison.

The External Review Committee will hold debriefing sessions with the Program Director and one or two members of the program executive committee, School Dean, and the Graduate Dean. Committee members may request additional meetings with campus representatives and/or changes to the agenda as appropriate.

The site visit agenda and details may be altered as appropriate at the discretion of the program and the Graduate Division. Sample one-day and two-day agendas are included in this document for use or modification.

VII.   Program Review External Report

The chair of the review committee is responsible for coordinating the writing of the External Report. The purpose of the report is to provide a thoughtful, objective, and

comprehensive assessment of the program under review, as described in the section **Academic Program Review: External Report Guidelines**. In consultation with the Graduate Dean, the program may customize the report guidelines so as to have the review emphasize areas that are most appropriate and useful for the program.

The report should include the strengths and achievements of the program, critical issues to be addressed, a set of recommendations, and comments on the future direction of the program.

The report should be finalized within four weeks of the site visit and forwarded to the Graduate Dean for distribution to the Graduate Council.

VIII.   Graduate Council Review

The Graduate Council Liaison and Graduate Dean lead the discussion of the External Report at a Graduate Council meeting. The Council corrects any factual errors in the report, analyzes the assessment and the recommendations to the program, and prepares a written request to the program to respond to specific issues in the review. The written request for a response will include recommendations for which the program has direct responsibility and those for which the school dean and other campus leaders need to be involved.

IX.   The Program Response

The graduate program director, in collaboration with the faculty, prepares a written response to the External Report. The response should include the program's assessment of the report, the plan and timeline for addressing the recommendations of the External Review Committee, changes that have occurred since the review, and future directions. The program's response should be sent to the Council and Graduate Dean within two months of receiving the External Report.

X.   Follow-up and Post Review Process

The role of the Council in the post-review process is to serve as an advocate for the program, provide an overview of the strengths and limitations of the program to senior leadership, and identify areas that may require follow-up and attention prior to the next review. The Council makes the determination on a case-by-case basis as to the need to invite the graduate program director and/or school dean to a Council meeting to discuss the recommendations of the review. Such a meeting is designed to develop a shared understanding of the strengths and needs of the program and to highlight those areas that may require additional resources.

In certain cases, the Graduate Council will request an update from the program director two years after the review, in order to ascertain the program's progress in implementing recommendations stemming from the External Report.

A copy of the External Report, the Graduate Council letter, and the response from the graduate program are forwarded to the School Dean, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and Chancellor at the close of the review process.

Approved by Graduate Council on 5.08.2014

Replaces document:
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (November 2008)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY

Degree Program

1. Provide a brief history of the program at UCSF, its goals, and major areas of scholarship. What role does the program play within the larger UCSF community? Are there any unique characteristics of the graduate program that distinguish it from similar programs at other institutions?

2. What are the requirements for completion of the degree? Include course requirements, participation in program seminars and activities, and required research/lab rotations.

3. Summarize the recommendations made by the external reviewers in the previous program review, and describe whether and how the program has addressed these recommendations.

4. Describe any new initiatives or directions that are planned over the next five years.

Faculty

1. Provide a list of all faculty who are actively engaged in the graduate program. For each faculty member provide a CV in NIH Biosketch form or UCSF format.

2. What are each faculty member's teaching commitments, including formal didactic courses, participation in journal clubs and other program activities, and direct supervision of thesis students?

3. List faculty research support for the current year and the last five years.

4. Describe any changes that have occurred in program faculty over the last five years. Include any newly hired faculty and those who have left UCSF and the reasons for their departure.

Student Admissions, Enrollment, and Academic Progress

1. Describe the program's selection process for admitting new students. Describe outreach efforts to achieve diversity in the admission process. Please include any other factors crucial to the criteria you use in selecting students.

2. Describe how student progress towards degree is evaluated, including specific mechanisms in place for review and structures in place for individual supervision, advising, and counseling. What support systems exist to identify students who may be having stress-related or other personal problems and for directing them to appropriate treatment services?

3. Indicate any students who have withdrawn or been dismissed and the reasons for these actions.

4. Provide a list of the publications and presentations of current graduate students in the program.

5. List the title of all dissertations completed within the last 5 years. Please provide ONE copy of each of the last five dissertations from your graduate program or the URL where it can be accessed.

6. Provide information on graduate employment including first and present positions. This list should cover students who have graduated during the last 10 years.

Learning Outcomes

1. Describe the learning outcomes for the program: the specific knowledge, abilities, and skills that students should acquire. How do your degree requirements and benchmarks enable you to assess learning outcomes for your program? For example, what is the purpose of the required courses? What do exam committees look for in written and oral examinations and final defenses? What do you expect students to take away from required activities like teaching, conference presentations, and grant/fellowship applications?

2. Describe the evaluation plan for the degree program. The evaluation plan should specify how learning outcomes assessment is used to conduct broader programmatic assessment. What specific data will be collected and how often will they be reviewed?

3. How are students informed of the program's learning outcomes?

4. UCSF has two institutional learning outcomes – knowledge and professionalism. Describe how your program satisfies these two required outcomes.

Resources

1. For all registered students, list all sources of support and dollar amounts including all national and local fellowships, scholarships, training grants, research and teaching assistantships, and self-support.

2. Indicate other sources of extramural support, such as endowments and dollar amounts directly related to the graduate program. Do you receive industry support? How does your program support student recruitment, interviews, retreats, and administrative assistance?

3. Describe the space and other resources available for training graduate students (laboratories, office space, library holdings, computer time, etc.)

4. Describe resources available for student participation in local and national conferences.

5. Are the resources available for your graduate program adequate? What resources would be needed to make the program more effective and to further its mission? Include any suggestions for remedies, if needed. Are there issues that the Graduate Division or campus should address?

Administration

1. Describe the administrative structure for your program.

2. What role do students play in programmatic decisions within the graduate program?

3. What is the extent of interaction and coordination with other interdisciplinary programs, departments, and schools at UCSF?

4. Please provide a copy of the administrative budget with a statement highlighting any projected shortfalls or deficits that will need to be addressed by university leadership.

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR PROGRAM SELF-STUDY TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION at least 3 weeks prior to the review.

Approved by Graduate Council on 5.09.2014

Replaces document:
PREPARING FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (November 2008)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: SAMPLE 1-DAY AGENDA

Date-Room TBA

8:00 am   Van or Taxi pick up at Hotel

8:30 am   <u>Welcome and overview of review process.</u>
                       Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
                       Dean of School, if available
                       Dean of the Graduate Division
                       Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs
                       Graduate Council Faculty Liaison

9:00 am   <u>The Graduate Program: Organization and Leadership.</u>
                       Graduate Program Director and Executive Committee

10:00 am   Break

10:15 am   <u>The Graduate Program: Admission Process, Selectivity, and Student Support</u>
                       Graduate Program Director and Admissions Committee

11:00 am   <u>The Graduate Program: Core Curriculum and Research Training</u>
                       Graduate Program Director, Graduate Advisors, relevant course directors

Noon   Lunch with students (closed to Program Faculty and Staff)

1:30 pm   Discussion with Alumni

2:30 pm   Break

3:00 pm   Discussion with Current Program Faculty

4:00 pm   Discussion with Departmental and Program Leadership on Future Plans

5:00 pm   Review Panel Executive Session

6:00 pm   <u>Van or Taxi pick-up. Working dinner and debrief</u>
                       Provide reviewers with a copy of the previous Academic Program Review
                       Review Committee, Senior Faculty, and Graduate Dean

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: SAMPLE 2-DAY AGENDA

Day 1 – Room TBA

8:00 am	Van or Taxi pick up at Hotel
8:30 am	<u>Welcome and overview of review process.</u> Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Dean of School, if available Dean of the Graduate Division Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs Graduate Council Faculty Liaison
9:00 am	<u>The Graduate Program: Organization and Leadership.</u> Graduate Program Director and Executive Committee
10:00 am	Break
10:15 am	<u>The Graduate Program: Admission Process, Selectivity, and Student Support</u> Graduate Program Director and Admissions Committee
11:00 am	<u>The Graduate Program: Core Curriculum and Research Training</u> Graduate Program Director, Graduate Advisors, relevant course directors
Noon	Lunch with pre-qualifying students (closed to Program Faculty and Staff)
1:30 pm	Executive Session
2:30 pm	Meeting with post-qualifying students (closed to Program Faculty and Staff)
3:30 pm	Break
4:00 pm	Discussion with Senior Program Faculty (Have been at UCSF > 5 years)
5:00 pm	Transportation back to hotel
6:00 pm	Van or Taxi pick-up Working dinner with Review Committee and Graduate Dean. Provide reviewers with a copy of the previous Academic Program Review

Day 2—Room TBA

7:30 am   Van or Taxi pick up at Hotel

8:00 am   Breakfast at UCSF
               Meeting with recent graduates of the program.
               (Note that postdocs are scheduled for a separate meeting at 11 am.)

9:00 am   <u>Future Plans for the Graduate Program</u>
               Graduate Program Director
               Director of umbrella organizations as appropriate, e.g., QB3, PIBS, Systems Biology

9:45 am   Meeting with new faculty (Hired in the last 5 years)

10:45 am   Break

11:00 am   Meeting with postdoctoral scholars

Noon   Lunch. Discussion of the results of the anonymous student survey

1:00 pm   Executive Session

2:00 pm   Debriefing with Graduate Dean

3:00 pm   Debriefing with Graduate Program Director, one to two members of the program's
               Executive Committee, the Graduate Dean, and the School Dean

4:00 pm   Adjournment

Approved by Graduate Council on 5.08.2014

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REPORT

The academic program review external report should address the areas outlined below. The report need not be confined to this particular organization or format. The review committee is encouraged to also provide specific recommendations on other relevant topics, e.g., student recruitment procedures, course offerings, etc.

I. Program

A. What are the goals of the program? Is it meeting its own goals and the expectations of others? Is it meeting the needs of the students, of the discipline, of the university, of society? What is the program's promise for future development and contributions?

B. Are curriculum offerings sufficiently diverse to allow for a broad range of educational experiences and specialization in the major sub-divisions of the discipline? How do program requirements (for example, courses, examinations, etc.) compare with those of other graduate programs in the field?

C. What coursework, seminars, and other educational experiences are offered in the area of integrity in science and professional conduct of scientists? How does the faculty communicate with students about ethical behavior in the conduct of research, in the analysis of data, and in the reporting of research findings?

D. Are sufficient resources allocated to the program to allow it to meet its goals? Are the resources allocated used in the most effective manner? Is the program as productive as possible given the resources available to it?

II. Students

A. Are students of high ability attracted to the program? What criteria are used in admitting students to the program? Does the program have an effective plan with sufficient resources for recruiting new students?

B. Are the students in this program diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background? What has the program done to promote and maintain such diversity? What is the history of the program's outreach efforts?

C. Does the program have established procedures for regularly evaluating student performance? Does the program ensure that adequate information and good advice are provided to students?

D. Do the students have sufficient opportunities to participate in program activities, committees, and to provide input on their experiences?

E. Do the students have ample opportunity to interact with faculty about research projects, teaching opportunities, and progress toward the degree?

F. Does the program provide sufficient financial support for its students?

G. Does the program have a support process or strategy to help students overcome problems that may impact on their academic progress?

H. Do students complete the program within normal time limits? What is the quality and scope of research results or other scholarly work published by graduate students?

I. Are students successful in finding suitable positions upon graduation?

J. What is the morale of the students in the program?

III. Faculty

A. What is the general scholarly quality of the faculty of the program? Is the faculty adequate in numbers and sufficiently broad in interests for the program offered?

B. Do faculty members receive sufficient support for their teaching and advising activities in the graduate program?

C. Are faculty members of quality being recruited and retained? Is the faculty diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity and background?

D. What is the morale of the faculty in this program?

IV. Physical Facilities and Other Resources

A. Is the physical plant, e.g., classrooms, office space, laboratories, study and lounge areas, satisfactory? Is the library adequate to support the instruction and research needs of the program? Are web-based resources sufficiently utilized by members of this graduate program?

B. Is there adequate equipment to support graduate instruction and research? Is there adequate administrative, technical, and other staff assistance for this graduate program?

V. Strengths, Weaknesses, Recommendations

Approved by Graduate Council on 5.08.2014

Replaces document:
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW EXTERNAL REPORT SUGGESTED
GUIDELINES (November, 2008)

APPENDIX I: SCHEDULE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

| **2014** | spring | Oral and Craniofacial Sciences (MS) |
| | fall | Sociology PhD |

| **2015** | winter | Nursing PhD |
| | spring | Medical Anthropology PhD |

| **2016** | spring | Dental Hygiene (MS) |
| | | Clinical Research (MAS) |

| **2017** | spring | Biomedical Imaging (MS) |

| **2018** | spring | Global Health Sciences (MS) |

| **2019** | spring | Epidemiology and Translational Science PhD |
| | | Translational Medicine (MTM-MS) |

| **2020** | | none scheduled |

2021	winter	History of Health Sciences PhD
	spring	Dental Hygiene (MS)
	fall	Oral and Craniofacial Sciences (MS)

Schedule as of May 2014. Schedule may be adjusted as necessary by the Program with concurrence of Graduate Council and Graduate Division.