



## MEMORANDUM

To: Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Bruce D. Friedman, Chair, UPRC   
The University Program Review Committee  
Maynard Moe, BJ Moore, Roger Peck, Robert Provencio,  
Maureen Rush, Sarah Vanderlip, and Carl Kemnitz, *ex-officio*

C: Soraya M. Coley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: July 6, 2012

Re: Summary Report of the UPRC for the 2011-12 Academic Year

---

### Accomplishments

- Completed eight program reviews (PEAK, Natural Science, Spanish, Physics, Psychology, Health Care Management, Educational Counseling, Education)
- Improved committee record keeping – although need to maintain consistency for minutes every meeting.
- Conducted a qualitative assessment of the UPRC process by interviewing those completed programs under the new system.
- Submitted a report to the Senate requesting continuation of the UPRC
- Identified concerns in the discontinuance process and recommended the development of a policy for moratorium.
- Identified operational aspects that can be used to streamline the report process (although still needs some work)
- Began a process of changing the culture on how programs view program review. Not all programs are there, yet, but there is an improvement in the way self-studies are written to truly demonstrate their role and value within University.
- Participated and assisted in the WASC process and received a commendation from WASC committee

## Areas of concerns identified

- Fluid nature of deadlines, many programs request extensions, so deadlines do not seem to mean much.
- Lack of consistency in deans' reports and timeliness of dean reports (two weeks following external review). Recommend that when the external review is received and sent to the appropriate persons that a note be included in the report to the dean reminding him/her that they should submit a response within two weeks.
- Breakdown in the timeline between the UPRC report and the MOUAP.
- Workload in the fall, since many programs are completed in the spring with little carry over, then there seems to be a gap in the work in the fall until program self-studies arrive and external reviewers are scheduled and submit their reports.
  - The fall could be used to work with programs in the forthcoming review year to begin the planning for their coming program review
  - The fall could be used to modify the template process by reducing redundancy.
    - It was also suggested that an item of the template could include a statement as to how the program would like the review to be conducted to assist with the review language not appearing to be negative.
- Definition of program and department since there are times when the problems are departmental problems that transcend into the program.