

Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives] (especially Criterion for Review (CFR) 1.2 [Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution]), Standard 2 [Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions], and Standard 4 [Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement].

The campus has conducted a preliminary review of the four WASC Standards and has identified areas of focus for the coming years. In addition to the aspects of Standards that will be addressed by formal definition of faculty aspirations for undergraduates (see above), the campus will pay particular attention to the following Criteria for Review (CFR): 2.7 [Program Review], 3.4 [Faculty Development Activities], and 4.4 - 4.8 [criteria associated with Commitment to Learning and Improvement].

The last UCR Self-Study for Accreditation, submitted in January 1998, was an experimental study focused on the role of undergraduate education in a research university that was planning for growth from an enrollment of fewer than 10,000 students to an enrollment of 15,000 students. During the intervening seven years the campus has reached a fall enrollment of over 17,000 students, but the growth has been almost entirely in undergraduate students. There are 6,708 more undergraduates (an 80 percent increase) and only 498 more graduate students (a 33 percent increase). As a result, the campus is seriously addressing the need to achieve a better balance of undergraduate and graduate/professional programs and students through a focused plan to increase the number, quality and diversity of its graduate and professional programs and students. The campus has also reached the point where it can no longer accommodate all qualified applicants for freshman admission and is initiating selective admissions through a process known as comprehensive review. In addition, such infrastructure elements as academic support systems and types and numbers of classrooms may not have kept pace with the rapid growth in enrollment.

The last Commission action letter concerned further planning for and monitoring of enrollment growth. Now that the campus has reached a stage of more moderate growth, that action letter is less relevant. The first review of campus programs by the Substantive Change Committee took place in April 2005 and resulted in approval: plans to offer graduate MBA and MFA programs at what will become the Palm Desert campus of UCR. At WASC's request the campus did not submit an Interim Report following its last Reaccreditation Review, but was placed directly into the new cycle of Reaccreditation under the 2001 WASC Handbook of Accreditation.

## **2. Description of Outcomes**

The campus has established a WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee with two subcommittees: Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness.

- A. The Institutional Capacity Subcommittee will conduct the Preparatory Review, with progress reports to the Steering Committee, and will draft the Preparatory Review Report for review and action by the Steering Committee. The plan of work of the Subcommittee is found under Section 4. **Approach for the Preparatory Review,**

below. The Institutional Capacity Subcommittee expects to achieve the following outcomes in the Preparatory Review and the Preparatory Review Report:

- 1) Development and publication of the University (data) portfolio to include not only an extensive set of data about the University, but also information about student self-assessment of learning, more comprehensive measures of co-curricular student learning (where possible), better measures of the effectiveness of experiential learning of students (including research, field work, and internships), and, where possible, more post-graduation measures of student learning and academic success.
  - 2) Establishment of a web-based inquiry system that will provide all members of the campus with access to institutional data relevant to student learning. The system will respond to specific questions about student characteristics and performance, producing responses that are based on clearly defined data elements, measured at specified points in time, and integrated across different data collection systems. It will include access to a longitudinal student database.
  - 3) Development of a culture of evidence that forms the basis for recommendations and decisions made by Academic Senate committees, administrators, departmental faculty, and others concerned about student learning.
  - 4) Design and implementation of formal, campus-wide reviews of undergraduate programs, leading to their improvement.
  - 5) More rigorous evaluation of curricular experiments and approaches, including new approaches to class scheduling for the satisfaction of general education requirements, new programs to deal with preparatory needs of freshmen students, attempts to deal with student deficiencies in preparation for specific courses, and attempts to reorganize curricula to meet specific student learning objectives.
  - 6) Implementation of successful curricular experiments in other applicable segments of the campus.
  - 7) The marshaling of comprehensive evidence related to the Special Themes being investigated in the Educational Effectiveness Review.
  - 8) Assignment of clear responsibilities for institutionalizing the progress achieved through the Preparatory Review process.
- B. The Educational Effectiveness Subcommittee will conduct the Educational Effectiveness Review, with progress reports to the Steering Committee, and will draft the Educational Effectiveness Report for action by the Steering Committee. The plan of work of the Subcommittee is found under Section 5. **Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review**, below. The Educational Effectiveness

Subcommittee expects to achieve the following outcomes into the Educational Effectiveness Review and the Educational Effectiveness Report:

- 1) Explicit definition of faculty aspirations for undergraduate students at the program level and the use of faculty aspirations in the assessment of student learning at all levels.
- 2) Refinement and improvement of the campus processes for assessment of educational effectiveness (data collection and analysis and feedback into the improvement of student learning).
- 3) Establishment, by fall 2005, of faculty workshops and consultant sessions on educational effectiveness, to assist in the broader use of educational effectiveness processes on the campus.
- 4) Design and implementation of instructional development programs to improve teaching effectiveness, student learning and faculty assessment of that learning.
- 5) In depth study of specific Special Themes (see Section 5. **Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review**, below) and the integration of the results of that study into the improvement of student learning at UCR.
- 6) Discovery of patterns of student success at UCR that can be used by the Undergraduate Council to refine the criteria used in the comprehensive review of applicants for freshman admission.
- 7) Definition of the characteristics of the students most likely to succeed at UCR and for whom UCR would be the best UC campus for them to attend (including their response to campus efforts to smooth their transition and maximize their success), followed by establishment of ways to contact and attract such students as applicants.
- 8) A comprehensive strategic plan for future development and improvement of student learning on the campus.
- 9) Assignment of clear responsibilities for institutionalizing the progress achieved through the Educational Effectiveness Review process.

### **3. Constituency Involvement**

The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (who is the chief academic officer of the campus) appointed the WASC Steering Committee for the campus in November 2004 to guide the development of the Proposal for Accreditation and to implement the Proposal upon its approval by WASC. The co-chairs of the Steering Committee are a Vice Provost and a key faculty member. The faculty members were appointed on recommendation of the Academic Senate. The undergraduate representative was appointed on