**Memorandum of Understanding to Guide the**

**Undergraduate Program Review of the** [INSERT SCHOOL]

Academic program review consists of high quality, on-going reviews of all undergraduate degree programs. The purpose of the reviews is to ensure continuous quality improvement in teaching, learning, curricular and co-curricular offerings, student services, and student outcomes.

Undergraduate program reviews at USC have the following characteristics:

1. Reviews provide a concise, honest appraisal of an academic unit’s strengths and weaknesses.
2. Reviews are forward looking and provide recommendations for improvement.
3. Reviews are evaluative, not just descriptive.

Each program review must include consideration of the issues described in the Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Review.

The Review Committee should thoroughly and candidly evaluate:

1. The mission and intellectual profile of the undergraduate program.
2. The quality of the degree program(s) among peers in the discipline, including the coherence of curricular program and the extent to which the program is aligned with the future direction in the field.
3. The stature and diversity of the teaching and advisory faculty.
4. The quality and effectiveness of academic advising and other student services.
5. Interdisciplinary programming, internships, and other experiential learning opportunities, opportunities for study abroad and opportunities to conduct research with [INSERT SCHOOL] faculty.
6. Improvements that are possible without the need for massive infusions of University resources.
7. Improvements that are possible only with additional resources.
8. Whether there are entrenched or irreconcilable issues within the school that constrain its effectiveness, and whether there might be more effective ways of working together.

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sets forth additional issues that the Provost, the Dean, and the school have identified as questions of particular importance for the unit under review. Please be aware that the additional issues are in addition to, and must not supplant, the eight specific areas for evaluation listed above. Both the school, in its self-study, and the Review Committee should provide their analyses of these issues during the review process. We note that the review itself may raise additional issues during the process of assessing a unit’s strengths and weaknesses.

The additional questions identified as important to address during this review are the following:

* *To be completed at the MOU meeting*

The MOU also outlines the general composition of the Review Committee. The following provides guidance with regard to the composition of the Review Committee:

The Review Committee should include representatives from institutions with the following types of programs:

* *To be completed at the MOU meeting*

Institutions from which Review Committee members could be drawn:

* *To be completed at the MOU meeting*

The internal member of the Review Committee might be drawn from the following programs at USC:

* *To be completed at the MOU meeting*

The following are collaborating units, centers, or groups of faculty that might be included in the site visit and/or particular groups within the unit which should meet separately with the review committee:

* *To be completed at the MOU meeting*

The self-study should be completed no later than **[INSERT DATE]**. If the school needs any information that is gathered centrally for use in its self-study, it should contact the Provost’s Office or the Dean’s Office for that information. During this time, the Provost’s Office will work with the relevant dean(s) and/or director to select the appropriate internal reviewer(s) and to invite external consultants to participate in the site visit.

Signed:

Elizabeth Graddy

Executive Vice Provost

Provost’s Designee

[INSERT NAME]

Dean

[INSERT NAME]

Head of the Program

cc: Charles Zukoski

Robin Romans

Donna Garcia