GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS AT UCSD

UCSD reviews all graduate programs every eight years, using a review committee selected by the Associate Dean of the Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs (GEPA) in consultation with the program under review, the dean of the division or school, and external consultants in the discipline.

The committee members' schedules, program preferences, and campus administrators' schedules guide the date selection for the review. Once the date is set, the program is given a timeline for submission of all profile data, usually eight weeks prior to the committee's review/site visit.

The committee is provided with a program profile, prepared jointly by the program under review and GEPA following the established outline. Graduate students and degree recipients are surveyed and the results of that survey are included in the profile. GEPA compiles the final profile and sends it to all involved.

The program submits a proposed agenda for the program's review following the sample provided. The goal is for the committee to meet with as many faculty, students, and administrative staff as possible - not just a single representative group. The committee spends one to two days meeting with the graduate deans, the division or school deans associated with the program, program faculty, staff, and students. The visit culminates in a meeting with the Dean and Associate Dean of UCSD Division of Graduate Education and Postdoc Affairs, the Dean and Associate Dean from SDSU Graduate Studies, the division or school dean, a representative of the Graduate Council, and the review committee.

The program is responsible for the preparation of the materials including the program profile, review agenda, and graduate student representatives, for submission to GEPA. GEPA is administratively responsible for the review process, including the finalization and distribution of the review materials and coordinating with the committee members.

The committee's role concludes with a written report submitted to the Dean of GEPA, usually within three months of the review. The report is circulated to all persons involved in the review process, and the program is asked for a response to the report. The Graduate Council expects the response to include faculty and student input.

The Graduate Council first considers the report and program response. The Graduate Council representative who participated in the site visit serves as the Council's lead reviewer. Traditionally, the Graduate Council focuses on curricular matters, program quality, and student issues. The Chair of the Graduate Council then sends the program a letter outlining the Council's conclusions and expectations for actions regarding issues raised in the review.

After the Graduate Council completes its review, a "wrap-up" meeting is held with the program directors, both the Dean and Associate Dean of GEPA and Graduate Studies at SDSU, the division or school dean, and the Graduate Council representative. Typically, the wrap-up meeting addresses overall program quality, resource issues, and mid- and long-term program plans.

One year after completing the program review process, the Graduate Council conducts a follow-up review to assess the program's progress in addressing issues raised in the review.

Graduate Division Responsible Persons:

Thad Kousser, Associate Dean, tkousser@ucsd.edu
Erica Lennard, Assistant Dean of Graduate Academic Affairs, erica@ucsd.edu
Alfredo Alegria, Institutional Research Analyst, a3alegria@ucsd.edu
MaKenna Dahl, Program Review Coordinator, mdahl@ucsd.edu

GUIDELINES GOVERNING UCSD/SDSU and UCSD/CSUSM JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM

In order to make clear its views regarding joint-doctoral programs, the Graduate Council has issued the following guidelines relating to the review.

Program Review

1. The UCSD and SDSU/CSUSM administration must jointly undertake regular reviews of each joint doctoral program.
2. Review committees, in addition to considering the usual issues that are the subject of program reviews, should determine whether the program provides significant academic benefit and academic excellence to both UCSD and SDSU/CSUSM, and if faculty from both Universities play substantial and active roles in admissions, advising, and instruction.
3. Review committees must be composed and charged in a manner consistent with that followed in reviews of independent UCSD doctoral programs.
4. Once a review committee report has been submitted, each campus should follow its normal procedures for handling of such reports.
5. When a review is completed, the UCSD and SDSU/CSUSM graduate deans should issue a joint statement to the program indicating the outcome of the review and actions to be taken by the program and the administration.

UCSD Graduate Council 2/5/91

ACADEMIC SENATE: SAN DIEGO DIVISION, 0002
UCSD, LA JOLLA, CA 92093-0002
(858) 534-3640
FAX (858) 534-4528

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
PROGRAM DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: Explanation of the Graduate Program Review Process

The goal of the University is that all graduate programs will strive to be of the highest quality and produce future leaders in the field. The Standing Orders of the Regents (sec 105.2) places responsibility for the quality of all courses and curricula with the Academic Senate. The campus Graduate Council is the arm of the Senate that has this responsibility for all graduate programs. Graduate Council responsibility involves initial approval of a program as well as oversight of a regular external review of program performance. Reviews are conducted by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Graduate Council and the administration.

The external review committee's report is expected to pay particular attention to and comment on each of the following points:

a) quality of students admitted to the program
b) quality of curriculum
c) quality of research
d) completion rate and time to degree
e) student morale and commitment to the program
f) success with postgraduate employment
g) any structural issues that might keep the program from achieving its full potential

The external review committee is requested to submit its final report to the Dean of the Graduate Division within three months of the review. The report is circulated to all persons involved in the review process and the department is asked for a response to the report. The Graduate Council expects that the response will have faculty and student input. The departmental response is required to be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Council by the end of the quarter following the receipt of the external review report.

The Graduate Council assigns a lead reviewer to each program and it is the responsibility of this reviewer to lead the Council's discussion of the external review committee's report and the departmental response. After initial consideration, the Graduate Council may request the attendance of the Department Chair for clarification of the response. The Council will normally write a letter to the department noting any concerns that it would like addressed by the time of the Council's one-year follow-up consideration of the program. At this one-year review, the Council will vote on approval of the program up to the next external review cycle. The review cycle is every 7 years (maximum of 8 years).

Should the Council be concerned about the quality of the program and the plans of the department to improve the quality of the program, they may vote to allow the program to continue subject to an earlier external review (perhaps within 3 years) or the Council may vote to suspend admissions to the program until a satisfactory plan is put in place by the department. After the Graduate Council votes to approve continuation of the program, there is an administrative meeting coordinated by the Graduate Dean to consider any administrative issues that might affect the program.

At UCSD, we have a history of close co-operation between Departments and the Graduate Council and this peer review process has helped our graduate programs become some of the most sought-after across the nation.

Sarah Gille, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: External Review Committee Members

03/03/26

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM REVIEW PROFILE

I. Historical Review
   A. Introduction
   B. Summary
   C. Funding [Need from separate campuses, if necessary.]
   D. Admissions
   E. Progress to Degree
   F. Coursework
   G. Advantages Plans for Improvement [Need separate campuses, if necessary.]

II. SDSU Faculty and Hiring Plans [list of current faculty with CVs and hiring plans from SDSU]

III. UCSD Faculty and Hiring Plan [list of current faculty with CVs and hiring plans from UCSD]

IV. Tables [provided by UCSD Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs, to be reviewed by depts.]
   A. Number of New [since the last review, so all] Ph.D. Students by Gender, Citizenship, and Ethnicity
   B. New, Continuing/Returning, and Total Ph.D. Students
   C. Graduate Record Examination Scores for new Ph.D Graduate Students
   D. GPAs for new Ph.D. Graduate Students
   E. Graduate Degrees Awarded, Median Elapsed time to Degree from First Registered to Degree, and Median National Elapsed Initial Position of PhD Recipients
   F. Initial Position of Ph.D. Recipients
   G. Placement Information: Initial and Current Position of Ph.D. Recipients after Conferral of Degree

V. SDSU Facilities [SDSU provides]

VI. UCSD Facilities [UCSD provides]

VII. Degree Recipients Questionnaire Responses and Additional Comments [UCSD Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs develops and asks coordinators to distribute]

VIII. Grant Support relevant to the joint program during the past 5 years.

IX. Appendices
   A. Graduate Student Handbook
   B. UCSD Faculty CVs
   C. SDSU Faculty CVs
   D. Previous Review

PROCEDURES

1. Plan ahead. Preparation of this information is very time-consuming. You should plan the preparation of profile data to be a summer project. The due date given by the Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs once a site visit is scheduled is based on guaranteeing a timely delivery of the profile to the visiting committee.
2. Submit the entire profile in electronic format to Erica Lennard (via shared folder)
3. Start each major section (i.e., VIIIA.) on a new page.
4. Use a 1-inch margin on **both** the right and left sides.
5. Faculty vitae are to be submitted electronically (via shared Google Drive).
6. Some of the items listed in the profile outline may not pertain to your department. Please contact the Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs for clarification on any of the items.
7. Feel free to use other materials gathered for any other purpose (i.e., grant applications).

Contact Erica Lennard (erica@ucsd.edu**)** for clarification or further information on the overall process and for all non-statistical data compiled by the Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs.

NOTE: The Division of Graduate Education & Postdoc Affairs will provide the previous Review Report, Dept./Student Response, and Graduate Council Documents as an appendix.

GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW
TIME TABLE

Notified and provided guidance on review process/responsibilities: **Summer 2026** UCSD GEPA

Assembles committee, and determines dates and timetable: **Fall 2026**

The program prepares Profile/Self-Study: **Summer/Fall 2026**

Due dates for submitting materials to the Division of Grad Education & Postdoc Affairs:
The *Program will be advised of actual dates once the (remote) review visit dates are established.*

Narrative/Profile, faculty vitae, Preliminary Agenda: **8 weeks prior to the review**

Student Representatives must be notified by the program that they were selected and the program must provide the Graduate Student Names: **8 weeks prior to the review**

GEPA Finalizes Review Agenda: **6 weeks prior to the review**

GEPA Distrbutes Materials: **4 weeks prior to the review**

***NOTE*:** Entire faculty vitae is to be submitted electronically; the most recent research and publications are of primary importance.