

**UCI Senate Policy on Access to and Disposition of
Academic Program Review Documents**
(Approved November 21, 2000 by the Academic Senate Cabinet)

The UCI Division of the Academic Senate conducts periodic reviews of the academic programs under its jurisdiction. Authority for conduct of these reviews rests under Divisional Bylaws with the Council on Educational Policy (CEP) for undergraduate academic programs and the Graduate Council (GC) for graduate programs. Reviews are scheduled to occur on a seven year cycle. During academic year 2000 – 2001, the GC and CEP will conduct their reviews of the graduate and undergraduate programs of the School of Biological Sciences under the Joint Review Procedure adopted by the Cabinet June 11, 1999. The policy described here is intended to elaborate the General Statement on Confidentiality and Disposition of Academic Reviews of August 8, 2000 for application to the Biological Sciences Review in question and to serve as a model for the specific policies applicable to future academic program reviews.

Review of a given academic unit occurs in six phases:

1. **Data gathering and self study.** Materials generated in this phase result from a request submitted to the unit under review and data gathered from other sources. These materials are supplied to the Extramural Review Committee (ERC), which also receives a written charge (see phase 2).
2. **Site visit and report by an Extramural Review Committee.** In response to their charge, and following a site visit to the campus, the ERC submits a written report on their findings.
3. **Academic unit response.** This phase permits the unit under review to respond to and comment on the ERC Report.
4. **Analysis of the ERC report and academic unit response.** During this phase the CEP and GC separately consider the collected review documents as they pertain to their respective responsibilities for undergraduate and graduate programs; the Councils may also engage in dialog with the unit under review to obtain clarification or make additional inquiries.
5. **Commentary and recommendations from CEP and GC.** CEP and GC generate their written commentary and recommendations. These are distributed, along with other pertinent documentation, to other agencies of the Senate, to designated administrators, and to the unit under review.
6. **Follow-up and closure.** Two years after the submission of their commentary and recommendations CEP and GC review the response by the academic unit to the review. This brings a review to formal closure but does not preclude further Council action in response to a review.

Additional details of the review process as it currently operates can be found in the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews adopted by the Divisional Cabinet on June 11, 1999.

The present document is intended to enunciate Senate policy for access to and disposition of the Academic Program Review Documents. These documents can be divided into three categories:

1. **Working Materials.** These include the data and self-study materials detailed in Attachment 4 of the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews and tabular information requested from the UCI Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management (OASIM) as detailed in Attachment 5. The working material also includes the results of surveys of students, former students, and faculty and staff of the unit under review and any confidential communications from individual members of these groups that have been directed to the Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS) or the ERC. It is also appropriate to include with the working materials copies of any survey instruments used, any letters soliciting commentary from students, faculty, staff, and former students, the Request to the unit under review (Attachment 4), and the charge to the ERC (Attachment 3). It is the responsibility of the APRS to identify those components of the working materials that are to be considered confidential.
2. **Review Product.** The review product consists of the ERC report, the response(s) of the academic unit to that report, and summary commentary on the review and recommendations prepared by CEP and GC. These are the materials that will be distributed to report the outcome of the review. They will be delivered to the Chancellor (or his designee), to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies, to the chief administrator of the unit under review, to the administrators of other academic units with a direct interest in the product of the review, and to the Senate Councils on Planning and Budget (CPB) and Research, Computing, and Library Resources (COR). The APRS will make clear to the ERC and others who contribute to the review product how it will be distributed and used.
3. **Closure Documents.** Closure documents are generated during the follow-up and closure phase of the review which occurs two years after delivery of the review product. This phase of the review is detailed in Attachment 2 of the report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Joint Reviews.

Access to the working documents, review product, and closure documents will be governed by the following policies:

1. Prior to and during phase 5 of the review the above-defined working materials and review product will be available only to the members of the GC and CEP (and pertinent Senate staff) in exercise of their responsibilities for academic program review.
2. At the end of phase 5, and prior to distribution of the review product, the review product and working materials of the review will be collected in the Senate Office and any confidential components of the working materials will be permanently destroyed by the APRS.

3. Following delivery of the review product any current member of the Academic Senate may view the working materials and review product in the Senate Office for purposes of internal University deliberations only. It is the responsibility of the current Senate Chair to remove any confidential material from any copy of the the review product released to a Senate Member.
4. Follow-up documents will be added to the archived review materials when the review is closed. It is the responsibility of the current Senate Chair to remove any confidential material from any copy of the the follow-up documents released to a Senate Member.
5. The current Senate chair may, in consultation with the Cabinet, authorize other forms of access to or release of archived review materials.