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The May 2006 submission of this Institutional Proposal to WASC marks the beginning of a new cycle of formal reaccreditation activities under WASC’s Guidelines in the 2001 *Handbook of Accreditation*. Following acceptance by WASC, this proposal will provide the basis for UCLA’s institutional self-review and for the subsequent evaluation of UCLA by the visiting team and WASC Commission. The proposal begins with a description of our Institutional Context, including the institutional strengths and challenges that were the foundation for the proposed self-review. The remaining sections outline the institutional research questions, work plan and expected outcomes, and other elements related to the WASC Standards.

1. Institutional Context

*Background*

UCLA was founded in 1919 as the second campus of the University of California (UC) System. UC has grown to encompass ten campuses and is governed by the Board of Regents, a 26-member board of trustees. UCLA’s eighth Chancellor, Albert Carnesale, reports to the President of the University of California, who is accountable to the Regents.

The University of California’s 1974-1978 Academic Plan succinctly describes the University’s role:

> The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge.

Stemming from the 1960 California *Master Plan for Higher Education*, UC has an obligation to educate students from the baccalaureate to the doctoral level and to make its undergraduate programs available to all eligible California high-school graduates and community college transfer students who wish to attend the University of California. As the smallest of the ten UC campuses (174 buildings on 419 acres) with the largest enrollment, UCLA had reached an earlier planned enrollment plateau in the late 1990s. But the demands of a growing state population created a state mandate for UCLA to enroll 4,000 more FTE-students, and by the Fall of 2004, total state-funded headcount enrollment had risen to 36,617, including 24,946 undergraduates, 10,074 graduates, and 1,597 interns and residents. Additionally, 946 students are enrolled in non-state funded graduate programs, such as the Executive MBA and the Master of Public Health for Health Professionals.

In addition to students, the UCLA community includes nearly 4,000 faculty and academic staff, and approximately 23,000 non-academic staff. Every day, thousands of visitors take advantage of UCLA’s cultural, medical, and recreational facilities. At the same time, UCLA students and faculty provide outreach and service within the broad Los Angeles community and beyond. UCLA Extension is one of the nation's largest and most comprehensive continuing education providers, offering 4,500 courses and
programs to 65,000 adults in Westwood and throughout the Southland. This vibrant community of
learners, scholars, researchers, and practitioners, working with the public and other institutions and
agencies, advances and exemplifies UCLA’s tripartite mission of teaching, research, and public service.
UCLA is a rare phenomenon in American higher education: a relatively young institution that has
distinguished itself by rising to the top ranks of research universities in just a few decades.

Hallmarks of UCLA

Six distinctive and interrelated aspects have shaped UCLA’s historical development and define its current
circumstances: its geographical setting; its comprehensive programs; the breadth and strength of its multi-
and interdisciplinary programs; its superb faculty, students and programs; its cultural and ethnic diversity;
and its tradition of shared governance. These hallmarks were fundamental as we considered how UCLA
should approach reaccreditation under WASC’s core commitments to institutional capacity and
educational effectiveness.

UCLA’s geographical setting in Los Angeles—one of America’s largest and most diverse cities situated
right on the Pacific Rim—affords unique and mutual opportunities to UCLA and its surrounding
community. UCLA’s top-ranked hospital, world-class performing arts programs, extension and
continuing education programs, and outreach programs benefit the entire Los Angeles region. The
recently established “UCLA in LA” initiative exemplifies UCLA’s ongoing commitment to strengthening
ties to the community by building productive and positive relationships that enhance the quality of life for
Los Angeles residents. UCLA capitalizes on its geographic positioning through its Center for Community
Partnerships where UCLA students and faculty are engaged with community partners in nearly 200
programs in the Los Angeles region: providing services that support children, youth and families;
fostering economic development, and enriching arts and culture, and all the while integrating teaching,
research and service. Because of these and other programs, the Princeton Review recently recognized
UCLA as one of 81 “Colleges with a Conscience.”

Comprehensiveness is UCLA’s second distinguishing hallmark. The great breadth and depth of our
academic programs and adjunct operations and the meaningful bonds between them are remarkable. On a
single campus, UCLA offers more than 300 degree programs. The College of Letters and Science,
UCLA’s largest academic unit with more than 24,000 undergraduate and graduate students, offers top-
rated programs in the humanities, social sciences, life sciences, physical sciences, and international
studies. Seven professional schools mount highly ranked programs: in architecture, art, and music;
education and information studies; law; management; engineering; public policy, social welfare, and
urban planning; and theater, film, digital media and television. Four health science schools—medicine,
dentistry, nursing, and public health—are located proximately to the other academic units and the UCLA
hospital.

UCLA’s third hallmark, strong multi- and interdisciplinary programs, developed from these proximities,
and have been fostered at UCLA as means for solving problems in research and education that require or
benefit from cooperation across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Exciting multi- and interdisciplinary
research endeavors build on our key strengths in the professional schools and the College and enable new
bridges between disciplines to be created. UCLA was a pioneer among world universities when it created
the Molecular Biology Institute in 1965, bringing together scholars from many departments in the College
and health sciences who shared interests in this burgeoning field. The same pioneering spirit continues to
guide UCLA faculty in creating world-class programs and centers that span engineering, the physical
sciences, medicine, the life sciences and nanotechnology. Outside the sciences, faculty from the liberal
arts in the College and from the professional schools have come together to build vibrant programs in
areas such as ethnic studies, gender- and orientation-based studies, historically-based studies and
international studies. Moreover, many professional school faculty, including those who have no undergraduates in their own departments, offer freshman seminars, contribute to General Education, work with hundreds of undergraduates in the Student Research Program and collaborate with College faculty in campus research centers. Building on these real strengths in multi- and interdisciplinary education and research is central to UCLA’s future and integral to our reaccreditation plan.

UCLA’s fourth hallmark is the superb quality of its students, faculty, and programs. For just 4,300 freshman slots, UCLA receives over 42,000 applications, 44% from students whose high school GPAs are above 4.0,1 and UCLA is increasingly successful in attracting the very best applicants to matriculate here. UCLA has the largest proportion of transfer students of any UC campus, and they graduate at a rate consistent with native freshmen. Graduate student quality is also high, but UCLA faces growing competition in attracting the very top graduate students, both domestic and international, because the top private institutions are able to offer more generous fellowships. Faculty quality is outstanding, despite difficult recruitment and retention cases, the pressures of maintaining competitive salary levels, and the high cost of living in Los Angeles. The exceptional quality of the faculty and graduate programs is reflected in rankings by the National Research Council and specialized professional schools, as well as in the increasingly used U.S. News and World Report rankings, in which UCLA’s programs place among the best. Supporting and amplifying the efforts of UCLA’s scholars and researchers, the UCLA Library ranks among the top five in the U.S., with more than eight million volumes, nearly 80,000 serial titles, and millions of manuscript pages, photographs, sheet music, and other archival materials. For 16 consecutive years, the UCLA Medical Center has been ranked “Best in the West” by U.S. News and World Report. UCLA’s success in attracting research funding is further evidence for the quality of its faculty and programs; in 2003, UCLA ranked second among U.S. universities in total research spending, at $849 million.

Diversity is the fifth hallmark, and it is best illustrated by UCLA’s student population. Nearly 80% of UCLA’s undergraduates report at least one of their parents is foreign-born, 52% grew up speaking a language other than English, and nearly one third were not born in the United States. Over 23% report a family income of less that $35,000, and UCLA leads the nation in the percentage of students on federal Pell Grants (35%). Despite barriers that first-generation and low-income students often face, undergraduates are graduating in record numbers, with 6-year graduation rates for all students at 87%, and high graduation rates (78%) for underrepresented minorities. In 2005, the Washington Monthly published a new standard for evaluating the impact of college and university undergraduate programs in the United States. UCLA was ranked first as an “engine of social mobility,” based upon our “astoundingly high successful graduation rate given its large numbers of lower-income students.” Despite these successes, challenges exist. We struggle to increase the diversity of our professional and graduate school student populations, and at the undergraduate level the dramatic decrease in the number of African American students is a problem of alarming proportion. In addition, our population of foreign students, especially at the graduate level, has been decreasing and will continue to do so unless private funds can be raised for more graduate fellowships.

Sixth among UCLA's great strengths is a long and successful tradition of shared governance. In 1920, the Regents endorsed a memorial submitted to them by the Academic Senate that gave the Senate formal powers over educational policy concerning admission and degree programs, and guaranteed consultation in University affairs. This Regental resolution has been described as a watershed in American higher education, creating a system of shared governance that gives University of California faculty substantial influence over the affairs of the institution. Shared governance at UCLA is especially robust; our Senate organization engages the largest number of faculty and is among the most effective in the UC system. Two standing committees of the Academic Senate, the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council,

1 With extra weighting for advanced placement courses.
focus on the faculty's responsibility for educational programs, principally through our eight-year program review process, which the Councils administer. Other standing committees are responsible for admissions criteria, the appointment and promotion of ladder faculty, and budget and planning. The Senate's Faculty Executive Committees in each School and the College address local academic matters in concert with their deans. Joint Senate/administration committees have also proven to be an effective form of shared governance; key examples are the Information Technology Policy Board that addresses policy and budget aspects of IT and the Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee (CEAC), which deals primarily with admission levels and enrollment management. Many ad hoc joint Senate/Administration committees have also provided valuable guidance in areas such as undergraduate research, the academic calendar, teaching policies, and gender equity.

Budget and Planning Context

These hallmarks are consistent with the role of a public research university. They have been made possible by long-term commitment and financial support from the State of California for development of a top research university. In recent years, however, UCLA has been strongly affected by budgetary constraints, largely stemming from California’s financial difficulties in the wake of the bursting of the dot-com bubble. While UCLA has been aggressive in meeting the crisis of shrinking budgets through strategic and tactical planning designed to protect access and quality, support for both students and faculty has suffered, damaging our ability to compete with better-endowed private universities. Student fees, which were held below market for several years, have increased dramatically and may continue to rise. Despite aid programs for the most needy students, these increases have imposed perceived and real hardships on students and their families, often influencing applicants’ choices of institution. Because the additional income from student fees has merely replaced lost state funding, the higher cost of a UC education has not resulted in better services or improved student/faculty ratios. More positively, student enrollment growth has brought new faculty positions, with a concomitant ability to build in areas of high quality.

In this environment, excellent fundraising ability is more essential than ever. For the past five years, UCLA has consistently ranked among the top 15 higher education institutions, public or private, in annual fundraising, although our endowment remains well below those of private institutions. UCLA’s $2.4-billion campaign, announced in 1997 and scheduled to conclude in December 2005, has surpassed its goal, attracting more than $2.87 billion. The campaign raised UCLA’s average gift and pledge revenue to $282 million per year. The new UCLA initiative to Ensure Academic Excellence, designed to attract direct support for faculty and graduate students, has raised over $100 million in just two years.

Despite recent state budget difficulties, UCLA has been able to move ahead toward many important goals in part because of its strong internal planning processes. Led by the Chancellor and closely involving the Academic Senate, planning takes two forms. First, routine academic, budget, and capital planning enable UCLA to deal with and move beyond external limitations to preserve quality, maintain programs, and accommodate the growing faculty, student body, and research programs. Second, major planning efforts are periodically focused in key areas that require cross-organization cooperation and that recognize both weaknesses and opportunities. The UCLA Student Housing Plan, for example, has enabled UCLA to become the only UC campus able to offer all of its undergraduates the opportunity to live on campus, transforming UCLA from a commuter campus to a residential campus. This tradition of planning shapes UCLA’s approach to accreditation.
Campus Progress since the 1998 Reaccreditation

The three topics from our 1998 WASC reaccreditation review, General Education, diversity, and performance indicators, were, in effect, examples of periodic and specialized planning through which we have made significant advances. Below, we review our major achievements in each area. Each area remains a work-in-progress; by no means has UCLA completed all that it set out to do. In the 2008 Capacity and Preparatory Review, we will include a comprehensive essay for each topic, detailing our accomplishments, ongoing efforts, and remaining challenges.

In General Education, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has worked closely with the faculty to achieve five major goals: 1) creation of a common General Education curriculum for all UCLA undergraduates that is organized around three foundation areas of knowledge: Arts and Humanities, Society and Culture, and Scientific Inquiry; 2) redesign and full review of all courses that carry General Education credit; 3) development and implementation of twelve freshman cluster courses organized around broad, interdisciplinary topics of societal importance such as interracial dynamics, globalization, and "biotechnology" that are co-taught by faculty teams over the course of a full academic year; 4) introduction of over 100 new lower division seminars (many associated with cluster courses) and Writing II courses (writing within specific disciplines); and 5) establishment of a General Education Governance Committee, jointly appointed by the Undergraduate Council Chair and the Vice Provost, which has oversight of all matters pertaining to General Education and approves new General Education courses. One of the remaining challenges is to establish vigorous periodic reviews of the course offerings in each of the three foundation areas of knowledge. These reviews are slated to begin in 2006-07.

On the pressing issue of diversity, UCLA made significant progress by: 1) establishing a Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Diversity to provide oversight and report annually on issues of faculty, student, and staff diversity; 2) focusing on specific issues of faculty diversity through the appointment of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity and undertaking a series of faculty gender equity studies; 3) working to increase the diversity of the pool of UCLA-competitive applicants in local high schools and community colleges through the development of academic preparation and advancement programs; 4) approving departmental status for Asian American Studies and for Chicana and Chicano Studies, two programs that attract faculty and students with diverse cultural perspectives and provide innovative educational opportunities, and 5) incorporating diversity as one hallmark of General Education courses, based upon a new and comprehensive definition of academic diversity. Through explicit guidelines for General Education courses and through creation of departments and programs devoted to ethnic, gender and orientation studies, UCLA has significantly increased the attention given to diversity issues in the curriculum. Close attention has also been paid to the question of establishing a diversity requirement, as there is active student interest in this idea and UCLA is currently the only UC campus that has no such requirement; so far, UCLA faculty have rejected this option. Many diversity-related challenges remain; among these are increasing the number of African American students who are admitted and choose to attend UCLA, and meeting recruitment goals to achieve gender parity at the tenure faculty ranks.

Regarding performance indicators, UCLA took important steps to improve how we collect, analyze, assess, and reflect upon institutional data. These are outlined in Section 7: Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems. Challenges that remain in this area include creating a better synergy among the units devoted to assessment. The most daunting challenge, which is now being addressed, will be establishing effective programs to evaluate student learning and the effectiveness of various teaching techniques. This goal was not an issue in 1998, but it was made imperative by the new WASC Guidelines.
2. Expected Outcomes

Growing out of this context and looking ahead to UCLA’s future, we identified three special themes around which to base our studies and subsequent reporting for the 2008 and 2009 WASC reaccreditation visits:

- **Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience:** As a bookend to our work on General Education, we will develop and pursue a plan for all undergraduates to complete a capstone project as a culmination of their baccalaureate studies at UCLA.

- **Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research:** To further our commitment to interdisciplinary work, we will assess and improve our institutional structures, policies, and practices.

- **Using Educational Technology to Enhance the Student Academic Experience:** As part of our ongoing efforts to deploy technology more wisely at UCLA, we aim to improve the integration and effectiveness of educational technology.

Although the themes differ in emphasis, all three aim to enhance the educational experience of both undergraduate and graduate students, and all include innovation, implementation and assessment components. Each theme is presented as follows. First, background and contextual material are provided to explain the importance of the theme for UCLA at this time. Second, the Primary Goals that derive from this rationale are set forth in three parts: a) organizational structures and processes, b) faculty engagement, and c) student learning and culture. Third, the Campus Questions section suggests the nature of the inquiry that must be undertaken to pursue those goals. Finally, the Anticipated Results section describes what we envision will be completed or well underway, some at the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) and others for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER).

**Theme 1. Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience**

In *Reinventing Undergraduate Education* (Boyer Commission, 1998), the nature of the capstone experience is described as marshalling all educational experience “in a project that demands the framing of a significant question or set of questions, the research or creative exploration to find answers, and the communication skills to convey the results.” Faculty-mentored capstone experiences are valuable because they provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery and integration of knowledge in an active context within their discipline; at the same time, depending on the nature of the specific capstone and its disciplinary context, students show individual creativity, agency, personal reflection, and teamwork.

An important UCLA campus report on *Undergraduate Education in a Research Context* (UERC, Spring 2003) recommended that all undergraduates complete a capstone experience, defined to include not only research, but also creative performances, product designs, community service, and campus leadership projects. Currently, fewer than 20% of UCLA’s academic programs require such an experience. Of College seniors responding to the Senior Survey, 35% of all—but 57% of science students—reported conducting their own research, working on faculty-mentored research projects, or taking a small research-oriented seminar. While we are pleased that so many of our students are taking part in these invaluable experiences, we want to create a climate in which students and faculty alike view a capstone experience as the essential culmination of a UCLA undergraduate experience. Accordingly, we want to extend this opportunity to every student.
The UERC report provides a good foundation for UCLA to work toward this goal. The Undergraduate Council endorsed the report without reservation in Spring 2003. Many of the report’s recommendations have been implemented through initiatives undertaken jointly by Academic Senate committees and the administration. Those successes have already had a significant impact on the ways departments organize their undergraduate curricula, in many cases preparing the groundwork for a capstone experience by providing appropriate curricular space, and at the same time establishing an effective working dynamic that will be essential to the implementation of a campus-wide capstone initiative. Moreover, the manner by which UERC developed and pursued its recommendations provides a valuable model for approaching the capstone initiative. As that committee deliberated, it conceived its task as providing a mechanism for different parts of the campus to learn from other parts; as a result, many practices in one part of campus were adapted and implemented in others. Similarly, the various ways in which capstone experiences have been conceived and realized at UCLA (and elsewhere) might be catalogued to provide a menu of options from which departments and programs would choose. It will also be important to involve graduate students in the undergraduate capstone initiative, both as a resource and to provide them with mentoring experiences on this more advanced level, as an extension of their opportunities as teaching apprenticeships.

We plan to approach a capstone initiative in holistic terms, so that senior projects are not simply tacked on to existing majors. Ideally, the capstone should provide a pivot point of sorts. On one side, the curriculum will have been designed to support students’ successful completion of a capstone project. On the other, after completing a curriculum that begins with the broad view of General Education and later narrows to the tight disciplinal focus required of a capstone experience, students should have the opportunity both to present that work within a wider cultural and academic context, and to learn from similar capstone projects based in other disciplines.

Thus, the shaping of undergraduate education via the capstone experience should entail two slightly different thrusts. First, programs may need to be redesigned or retooled to prepare students in specific ways for working on research or creative projects. Second, venues will need to be created in which students can present their work and be exposed to work from other disciplines.

**Primary Goals:**

1. Create a campus vision and implementation plan for a senior-level capstone requirement.
2. Create and sustain a climate in which faculty broadly support the implementation of capstone experiences for all students.
3. Ensure the capstone experience enhances learning and enriches the student culture and community.

**Campus Questions:**

1. What types of experiences might fulfill the capstone function?
2. What elements need to be in place within a curriculum to support a capstone experience?
3. What are the challenges and barriers to implementing a universal capstone requirement, and how might they be overcome?
4. How can we assist departments in redesigning their curricula to support capstone experiences appropriate to their discipline and context?
5. How and in what venues might we celebrate students and mentors across campus who complete or enable outstanding capstone projects?
6. How might we extend graduate students’ apprenticeship opportunities to the capstone experience?
Anticipated Results:
1. Establish, in cooperation with Undergraduate Council, requirements and guidelines to provide students with appropriate options for completing a capstone experience.
2. Establish a calendar that would lead to implementation of the requirement for all admitted freshmen by Fall 2009.
3. Establish a meaningful way to record the completion of a capstone experience on student transcripts.
4. Implement expanded Undergraduate Council 8-year review instructions that require departments and interdepartmental programs to describe and assess the effectiveness of capstone requirements for each undergraduate major.
5. Over a period of years, organize administrative structures to allow students across disciplines to share their work.

Theme 2. Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research

Scholarship in the 21st century is characterized by innovations that cross and transcend historic disciplinary boundaries in the academy. Federal funding for research and training is increasingly being allocated to crosscutting programs that aim to solve problems at the boundaries between traditional disciplines and to create new opportunities for collaboration and discovery. Team-based multi-investigator research is now commonplace at major universities. Top-ranked institutions all have major interdisciplinary initiatives that are viewed as central to remaining competitive in recruiting the best students and faculty. Nevertheless, the 2004 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report, “Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research,” identifies barriers to interdisciplinary efforts that include limited resources, the academic reward system, differences in disciplinary cultures, the pursuit of national rankings (based on traditional disciplinary categorizations), differences in policies and procedures across departments, and decentralized budget strategies that advantage departments over interdisciplinary programs.

UCLA has tremendous strengths in interdisciplinary education and research. The curriculum is rich with crosscutting educational programs that serve its undergraduates and graduates, including 32 interdepartmental program (IDP) majors, 65 minors and 22 concurrent degree programs. In 2003-04, nearly 500 courses were offered that are multi-listed in two or more departments. Many faculty members participate in several departments and even schools through split appointments (5.4%) or joint appointments (24.5%),2 and many more are members of research centers. The faculty has been highly successful in garnering support for multi-investigator and multi-and interdisciplinary research and training programs that attract outstanding graduate students and visiting scholars. UCLA has over 80 national and campus-based multidisciplinary research centers, characterized by long-term institutional commitment and robust funding.

UCLA has done remarkably well in national competitions by building on key strengths in areas representing the convergence of engineering, the physical and life sciences and medicine, as well as in the humanities and social sciences, where the research linkages often extend to the sciences and the professional schools. An excellent example is the Center for Society and Genetics, which grew out of a Chancellor’s initiative and now involves faculty in History, Psychology, Philosophy, Medicine, Law, Public Health, and many other fields. Graduate education and training also have strong interdisciplinary themes, as exemplified by three successful NSF-IGERT programs and several crosscutting NIH training grants. In 2005, as part of the campus Budget and Strategic Planning process, the Chancellor identified initiatives in the Biosciences, Arts, and International Studies as important to the long-range goals of the

---

2 Split appointees have partial appointments in two (or more) departments; joint appointees have a 0% appointment in a second department.
campus; each initiative is grounded within the disciplines but has strong interdisciplinary components as well.

Even given this relatively favorable climate and strong tradition for interdisciplinary education and research, the Academic Senate and administration have identified significant challenges that threaten the sustainability and growth of our efforts. Many of these challenges mirror those identified in the NAS report, including administrative barriers between divisions and schools, inadequate space, scarce resources, and insufficient recognition for interdisciplinary efforts. At the Fall 2005 Chancellor’s Leadership Retreat, discussion centered on challenges associated with ensuring fair review of faculty members engaging in interdisciplinary scholarship and on developing administrative structures and funding mechanisms to nurture interdisciplinary efforts. A common perception on campus is that interdisciplinary programs are in competition with departments and research centers. We need to clarify how resources are allocated to programs, to articulate how those decisions are tied to faculty teaching contributions and student enrollments, and to ensure that those mechanisms are consistent with our institutional priorities and goals.

**Primary goals:**

1. Articulate a campus-wide vision and plan for interdisciplinary education and research.
2. Resolve known problems and remove barriers to faculty participation in interdisciplinary education and research, and create a porous, flexible environment that facilitates the flow of ideas and people across institutional boundaries.
3. Increase student awareness and engagement in multi- and interdisciplinary curricula, and develop tools to assess the effectiveness of interdisciplinary education. Our efforts to establish capstone requirements and improve educational technology (ET) are directly related to this goal.

**Campus questions:**

1. What metrics would enhance our ability to assess and develop interdisciplinary activities at UCLA?
2. How can UCLA improve its policies and procedures to nurture new areas of scholarship and interdisciplinary studies?
3. What changes are needed in current mechanisms for allocating faculty positions and conducting searches to make them more consistent with UCLA’s vision for the roles of interdisciplinary research and teaching?
4. How can the tenure and promotion processes be improved to ensure quality review of interdisciplinary research and teaching?
5. What barriers must be removed and what support services should be provided to promote and facilitate faculty participation in team teaching, interdisciplinary research and training?
6. What are our expectations for student participation in interdisciplinary courses, programs, and capstone experiences?
7. By what mechanisms should we gauge the educational effectiveness of interdisciplinary education at the undergraduate and graduate levels?

**Anticipated Results:**

1. Articulate a campus-wide vision for interdisciplinary research that can serve as the framework for improving and transforming structures and policies.
2. Create a more flexible environment for interdisciplinary efforts by refining and transforming existing mechanisms for initiating, supporting, reviewing and pruning programs across the campus.
3. Implement mechanisms and tools for promoting faculty engagement in interdisciplinary education and research.
4. Enhance existing mechanisms for evaluating and recognizing faculty who engage in interdisciplinary teaching and research.
5. Increase student participation by improving the visibility of interdisciplinary courses, programs and student research opportunities, and by implementing information technology tools that facilitate student counseling, mentoring and professional development.
6. Develop tools for assessing UCLA’s institutional capacity and educational effectiveness in interdisciplinary areas, and use these tools as part of academic program review.

**Theme 3. Using Educational Technology to Enhance the Student Academic Experience**

The research university of the 21st century must be knowledge based but student oriented, research driven but learner focused. With this theme, we intend to combine and build on our experiences over the past decade with technology in teaching and research to realize our vision of a better-integrated educational technology (ET) at UCLA. UCLA has the leadership and structures in place to articulate a vision, define policy, establish governance, and manage the deployment of ET, and thereby provide a campus-wide technology-enabled education and achieve a research-rich educational experience.

In 2001, UCLA established the Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB), a joint faculty senate-administrative committee responsible for strategic planning and policy recommendations for academic and administrative applications. The ITPB developed a campus-wide vision for ET at UCLA with two major components that encompass the educational and research environments: 1) to integrate students into an ET-enhanced, individualized teaching, learning, and research environment, and 2) to use the internet to support centers of scholarly interaction, both to engage students and to enhance external access to UCLA. Because of the importance of technology for education, the Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET) was created to advise the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Campus Information Officer (CIO) and ITPB on the use of technology in instruction.

UCLA has made a significant investment in the use of ET in undergraduate education over the past decade. Examples include classroom equipment and networks, computer labs, course management systems and other support for faculty, the use of blended instruction, and creation of the web-based MyUCLA portal. Consequently, most undergraduate lecture courses now use some online technology and many are significantly web-enhanced. However, UCLA’s highly distributed ET structure has resulted in duplicate services in some areas, insufficient services in other areas, and incompatibilities that limit cross-fertilization and interdisciplinary work. Similarly, while we have developed some understanding of the pedagogical value of ET, we lack a broad institutional approach for using ET, faculty-to-student and student-to-student, as a way to advance and transform undergraduate education or to integrate research and teaching.

UCLA intends to use this theme to clarify and strengthen its vision for providing a technology-enabled and research-rich education in the coming decade, and to reposition ET services, funding, and organizational structures to support this vision.

**Primary Goals:**

1. Create a campus-wide vision and implementation plan that leads faculty and students to conceive of ET as a natural part of their educational environment.
2. Develop scalable services for engaging, preparing, supporting and evaluating faculty and TA’s use of ET in teaching.
3. Build a research-rich educational environment for students using ET-enabled pedagogy.

Campus Questions:
1. What are the campus goals for transforming instruction in undergraduate education and how can ET be used to support those goals?
2. What ET infrastructure, services, policies, and processes are needed to create and sustain a research-rich educational environment for students and faculty?
3. What do we expect faculty and TAs to be able to achieve with technology in a research-rich course?
4. What do we expect undergraduate students to have experienced, know, and be able to do with technology as a research, learning and communication tool?
5. How can we cultivate faculty and student interest in meaningful uses of ET?
6. How will we measure our progress and success with ET?

Anticipated Results:
1. Create an evolving campus-wide vision and implementation plan based on the campus goals for transforming instruction and the role of ET.
2. Install and upgrade equipment necessary for students, faculty and TAs to use a variety of educational technology tools in all general assignment classrooms.
3. Establish effective services to train and routinely support faculty and TAs, enabling them to redesign and deliver courses that integrate research and the use of educational technology.
4. Adapt teaching evaluations and merit/promotion documentation to include evidence of learning improvements derived through the use of ET.
5. Define core and discipline-specific ET competency requirements for undergraduate and graduate students.
6. Develop and evaluate scalable methodologies to assess learning outcomes, in undergraduate courses and overall, achieved through the use of ET.

3. Involvement of Constituencies

Planning for UCLA’s Institutional Proposal to WASC began in the Spring of 2004 when the Chancellor and Provost agreed upon the creation of a WASC Steering Committee. At the same time, they agreed upon the “Special Themes” format, which had been so valuable when UCLA was reaccredited under an experimental process in 1998.

Consultation with the Academic Senate Chair about the approach and the initial workplan began immediately. Professors Robin Garrell and Raymond Knapp were invited to serve as co-chairs of the Steering Committee, and WASC agreed to delay submission of the Institutional Proposal by six months to allow for sufficient Academic Senate review. Steering Committee membership was determined collaboratively with the Academic Senate chair and with advice from the Senate’s Committee on Committees. The Steering Committee was formally appointed in December 2004 and met monthly during the 2005 Winter and Spring quarters. In January 2005, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) arranged for the two co-chairs, another Steering Committee member (the University Librarian), and key support staff to attend the WASC Institutional Planning Workshop.

The Steering Committee’s primary role was to consider and recommend the themes UCLA would use for its reaccreditation self-study. WASC’s “What Really Matters” approach enabled the group to coalesce.
around a number of possible themes, and small discussion subgroups were formed to flesh out the concepts. The full Committee agreed that the three themes presented in this Institutional Proposal share essential characteristics that make them ideal for reaccreditation focus: a foundation of institutional experience, grass roots faculty support, strong leadership within the faculty and the administration, evident commitment of UCLA’s leaders, and appropriate time frame. Furthermore, the themes are consistent with the WASC “Criteria for Review” (CFR) determined to be of highest priority by the Steering Committee. (See Appendix A, which links our chosen themes and integrative essays to the CFR.) As a consequence and after serious deliberation, the Steering Committee decided to recommend these three themes without recommending alternatives.

During the summer of 2005, the two co-chairs, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the ALO refined the theme concepts and developed the initial draft Institutional Proposal. In the fall, the WASC Steering Committee met to discuss and modify the draft for presentation to campus leadership. The Chancellor and Provost approved the themes, suggested minor revisions, and accepted the resulting draft Institutional Proposal. The Provost then sent that document to the Academic Senate Chair, deans, and vice chancellors to begin the formal review process, with appropriate deadlines to ensure that consultation could be completed in time for submission to WASC in May 2006.

NOTE: The nature of the consultation process will be described more fully at the time the final Institutional Proposal is produced. Elements of the process will certainly include discussion by the Senate Executive Board and Senate committees that are asked to comment. On the administrative side, there will be decanal consultation with Faculty Executive Committees, discussion by the Deans’ Council and the Executive Committee, etc. It is expected that efforts will begin in the Spring Quarter of 2006 to appoint and charge three taskforces, one to pursue each topic commencing in Fall Quarter, 2006. Through consultation with the Academic Senate Chair, consideration will be given to how best the Senate, especially its Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, can participate and help weave the three themes together.

4. Approach for the Preparatory Review

5. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

Our three themes will be the primary focus of both the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) and the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). Our intent is to provide reaccreditation team members, the campus community, and interested members of the public with a deep understanding of UCLA’s efforts and findings in each of the three areas. Theme taskforces will address the primary goals for each theme, which encompass organizational structures and processes, faculty engagement, and student learning and culture. While graduate education was not selected as a stand-alone theme, the Taskforces will be called upon to address related and vital issues for graduate education, including academic and professional degrees. The theme taskforces will keep in mind UCLA’s tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service, as well as the other accreditation themes and Chancellor’s initiatives, as relevant. For each theme, there will be two successive integrative essays, focusing first on C&PR and then on EER issues.

For the C&PR, we will demonstrate that UCLA fosters continual institutional change, and we will incorporate consideration of organizational structures, resources, processes, faculty engagement, academic values and educational objectives. We will present a total of nine integrative essays for the C&PR:

Theme Essays
1. Theme 1. Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience
2. Theme 2. Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research
3. Theme 3. Using Educational Technology to Enhance the Student Academic Experience

Institutional Framework Essays
4. Educational Effectiveness Indicators
5. Strategic Planning and Budget Process
6. Academic Senate Program Review

Progress Review Essays
7. General Education
8. Diversity
9. Performance Indicators

Essay 4 grows out of WASC’s requirement to provide an “Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators” that must include information about formal learning outcomes, an indication of where they are published, and a description of outcome measures/indicators other than GPA for each degree program. In Winter 2005, we knew there was great variability across programs, with some programs having outstanding and well-understood expectations and others providing less clarity. We considered how we might complete the Inventory for UCLA’s more than 300 degree programs in a manner that would involve departments and programs more seriously than simply requiring them to fill out yet another form. We also believed that the WASC inventory expectations should be integrated into UCLA’s existing 8-year program review process. We formed a small committee whose members had experience on the Undergraduate or Graduate Council or had served as department chairs. After considering their own programs’ record on these matters, the members began the process of developing a pilot set of guidelines that would enable each program to clearly and publicly identify student learning goals and to develop assessment approaches. The group plans to draft guidelines and assemble exemplars, with the goals of obtaining Undergraduate and Graduate Council approval to modify current program review guidelines and providing assistance to all programs in pursuing these new requirements. Thus, in this Institutional Proposal, we list all degree programs, but we complete the Inventory questions only for selected programs (Appendix B). We will, however, provide integrative essays for both the C&PR and EER that describe our progress, and expect that we will have more complete Inventories to share with the reaccreditation team at each interval.

Essays 5 and 6 will provide an overview of UCLA’s leadership, planning, and shared governance that will be essential for the reaccreditation team as it considers how UCLA meets the WASC standards and reviews our efforts on the three themes. In both essays, we will present an overview of the current processes and their evolution.

Essays 7, 8, and 9 will provide progress reports on our prior reaccreditation topics. In a November 11, 1998 letter, Executive Director Ralph Wolff indicated the Team had found “considerable momentum . . .

---

3 This requirement grows out of WASC’s Criteria for Review (CFR) and is described as follows in the instructions for the Inventory: “. . . institutions are expected to have educational objectives for degree programs and the institution as a whole (CFR 1.1, 1.2, and 2.4). In order to ensure that educational objectives are met, learning outcomes are to be reflected in academic programs and policies (CFR 2.3) and published and widely shared in the institution, with students, and among other stakeholders (CFR 2.4). The faculty is expected to take collective responsibility for reviewing and demonstrating the attainment of those expectations (CFR 2.4). The ongoing and regular collection and use of data help assure the delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded (CFR 2.6). Program review then examines and improves curricular currency and effectiveness of degree offerings (CFR 2.7) to ensure and improve student learning (CFR 4.4). In sum, for an institution to be committed to educational effectiveness, it must have in place a system that regularly uses evidence in a variety of ways to improve student learning. The indicators listed in this table collectively demonstrate an institution’s commitment to quality assurance systems that improve educational results over time (CFR 4.1 and 4.5).”
on three complex, comprehensive issues of great moment in American Higher Education,” and the Commission “encourage[d] the University to continue on its trajectory of implementation.” In these essays, we will discuss what has transpired since that time. The look back at General Education will present a broad review of all we have done since 1998 to enhance undergraduate education; this document will also provide essential background for our work on the capstone experience. The essay on performance indicators will demonstrate how UCLA values and uses data and evidence for institutional planning and decision-making. Similarly, the report on diversity will describe how UCLA has moved forward since 1998, within the constraints of state law and UC policies.

The EER will consist primarily of integrative essays on each of the three themes that will focus on academic matters, especially approaches to student learning, integration of research with teaching, and student learning outcomes. Because each theme will require ongoing institutional attention, we will also develop and present our plans to ensure that our successes will be sustained and that evolution and enhancement will continue.

All essays will include electronic links to relevant studies, related websites for faculty and students, germane data and evidence, and critical policy sources. Our goal will be to enable readers to delve into issues in which they have special expertise and interest, so they can become informed, question our approaches, and offer suggestions or criticism. UCLA has a wealth of existing information, reports, and plans that support ongoing institutional processes. Appendix C contains a preliminary list of some of the materials that will be incorporated in our institutional portfolio. Our priorities will be to include evidence of student learning (e.g., assessments of the Freshman Cluster Program, report on the 2005 Senior Survey) and to demonstrate how UCLA uses evidence in its institutional planning processes (e.g., reports for the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee).

At the time of each review, we will provide a detailed table that demonstrates how each integrative essay is responsive to the four WASC Standards and the related CFR.

6. Work Plan and Milestones

Planning for this reaccreditation process began in 2004-05. Our projected activities and emphases over the five-year period through 2008-09 will be as follows:

2004-05: WASC Steering Committee appointed and begins drafting Institutional Proposal
2005-06: Executive approval of Institutional Proposal and vetting with Academic Senate and Deans
2006-07: Formal work for C&PR and EER begins
2007-08: Focus on Developing C&PR Portfolio and C&PR Visit
2008-09: Focus on Developing EER Portfolio and EER Visit.

A more detailed workplan is presented in Appendix D. As with the preparation of this Institutional Proposal, we will develop specific annual schedules and related deadlines, and we will share them with all involved: the Academic Senate, departments, deans, and administrators.

7. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

UCLA has a long history of using institutional data effectively to inform planning, policy development, consultation, and decision making at the executive level, in joint groups such as the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee, by the Academic Senate, and by the deans, departments and faculty. Data will similarly inform the work of each reaccreditation taskforce.
Ongoing efforts are aimed at improving the quality and scope of basic data, access to the data, and analytical approaches. In the years since the 1998 reaccreditation, UCLA has made key improvements.

- **Assessment of learning.** The Office for Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER), established in 2001, is responsible for the assessment of UCLA’s innovative programs, such as the Freshman Cluster Program, the *Fiat Lux* seminar program, and the new Writing II program.

- **Structural aspects.** We now have a reinvigorated and well-integrated group of units with institutional research and data responsibilities: the Office of Academic Information Management (AIM) is responsible for official and comprehensive data and analyses dealing with students and faculty; the Student Affairs Institutional Research Office (SAIRO) focuses on student attitudes and experiences, and the Graduate Division maintains a comprehensive graduate student database.

- **Common institutional data.** Program review and strategic planning are enhanced by the implementation of: 1) a common set of data on students, faculty, finances, and space that is used by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils in the 8-year academic program review process, and 2) a set of Key Academic Indicators (KAIs) that provide common metrics across departments to facilitate strategic planning and enrollment management.

- **New data sources.** Outstanding sources of student opinion data are now available. UCLA participated in the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) in 2003 and 2004. In 2005, for the first-time ever, UCLA administered a senior survey, made possible by outstanding cross-unit collaboration among AIM, OUER, SAIRO, and the UCLA Alumni Association. This survey, which netted a remarkable ~87% response rate, is providing valuable data on student academic experiences and attitudes.

These topics, along with other examples, will be discussed fully in our essay on performance indicators for the C&PR.

### 8. Proposal Data Tables

The institutional data summary is included in Appendix E, and the required data exhibits are in Appendix F.

### 9. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs

At this time, UCLA has no off-campus programs and only one degree program in which 50 percent or more of the program is offered through distance learning: the M.S. in Nursing Administration degree. Following the normal review by the Substantive Change Committee, the formal letter of approval from WASC was dated February 26, 2002. The next routine 8-year program review will take place in 2007-08.

### 10. Institutional Stipulation

Appendix G provides an Institutional Stipulation Statement signed by Chancellor Carnesale.
## Appendix A

### Relationship of WASC Criteria for Review to UCLA Reaccreditation Themes

#### WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) Relevant to UCLA’s Reaccreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Educational Technology</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Purposes

1.3. The institution’s leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.

### Integrity

1.5. Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.

### Teaching and Learning

2.2. All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.

2.3. The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution’s curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum.

2.4. The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME ESSAYS</th>
<th>PROGRESS REVIEW ESSAYS</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK ESSAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix A

Relationship of WASC Criteria for Review to UCLA Reaccreditation Themes

### WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) Relevant to UCLA’s Reaccreditation

#### Teaching and Learning (continued)

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

2.5. The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.

2.6. The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

#### Scholarship and Creative Activity

|   | √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| √ | √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

2.8. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character.

2.9. The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

#### Support for Student Learning

|   | √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

2.10. Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape a learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success.

2.11. Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.

2.12. The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.

#### Faculty and Staff

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

3.3. Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.

3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purpose.

#### Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

|   | √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

3.5. Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kind of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.

3.6. The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kind to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution’s purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.

3.7. The institution’s information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.

---
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Relationship of WASC Criteria for Review to UCLA Reaccreditation Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME ESSAYS</th>
<th>PROGRESS REVIEW ESSAYS</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK ESSAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) Relevant to UCLA’s Reaccreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>√</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8. The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Thinking and Planning</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>√</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to Learning and Improvement</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4. The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of the institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution’s purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6. Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Relationship of WASC Criteria for Review to
(As of October 1 table is not filled-in)
Appendix C
Initial List of Materials to be Included in UCLA’s Web-Based Institutional Portfolio
(As of August 31; contents under ongoing review and refinement)

Relevant to Institutional Planning Processes
- Strategic Planning and Budget Processes
  - Chancellor’s strategic planning memoranda
  - Strategic Planning and Budget Process annual “Call Letters”
  - Samples of Faculty Renewal Model and related executive memoranda
  - April 2005 UC Report on Health Sciences Education, with recommendations for enrollment growth at UCLA
    (http://www.ucop.edu/healthaffairs/UC%20binder_final_9.1.pdf)
  - Competitiveness Taskforce: establishment and outcomes
  - Resource Allocation Advisory Group: establishment and outcomes
  - UCLA Housing Plan
  - Library Plan
  - OID 2005 Self-Review
  - Student Affairs Plan
  - Administration Plan
  - Capital Programs Plan
  - External Affairs Plan
  - Campaign UCLA materials
  - Academic Excellence Initiative materials
- Reports produced for/growing out of Executive Leadership Retreats
- Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee materials, including:
  - February 2003: Changing Graduation and Time to Degree Patterns (AIM)
  - April 2003: Long Range Enrollment Projections for UCLA (AIM)
  - October 2003: Planned and Actual Enrollment Growth at UCLA: A Review of the First Four Years under the Strategic Enrollment Growth Plan (AIM)
  - October 2004: Managing Enrollment at UCLA within the 2010-11 Targets (AIM)
  - October and November 2004: Review of Improving Graduation and Time to Degree Outcomes for Undergraduates (AIM)
  - November 2004: Graduate Applications, Admissions and Enrollment: Comparison of Fall 2004 and Fall 2003 (Graduate Division IRIS)
  - January 2005: Presentation of UCLA Results for the 2003-2004 UCUES Surveys (UC Undergraduate Experience Survey) (AIM)
  - March 2005: College Campuses: Where are the Men? The Decline of Male Enrollment and Degree Attainment in U.S. Higher Education (Bellanti)
  - May 2005: Enrollment Yield for UCLA Admitted First Year Students, Fall 2003 and Fall 2004—Analysis and Recommendations (Lifka and Fox)
o Graduate student support analyses and related materials
o The Report of the Joint Academic Senate/Administration Committee to Study the UCLA Academic Calendar, November 1, 2002
o Report of the Joint Academic Senate/Administration Taskforce of Departmental Workload Policies, January 30, 2004

Relevant to Academic Program Review at UCLA

o UC Academic Personnel Manual
o The UCLA Call: A Summary of Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures
o Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council 8-year program review guidelines
o Exemplar 8-year program reviews
o Examples of data provided to units preparing for their review
o Instructions of review of ORUs
o Exemplar reviews

Relevant to Undergraduate Education and General Education

o General Education Foundation Area Reports from 2002 Reform
o Assessments of the Freshman Cluster Program
  ▪ Four Years Later: Senior Students Reflect Back on their Freshman Cluster Experiences, Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER), April 2005.
  ▪ Fiat Lux Reports
    ▪ Assessment of the Fiat Lux Freshman Seminar Program, Inaugural Year 2002-2003, October 2003
  ▪ Published articles on undergraduate education innovation at UCLA:
  ▪ Report of the Joint Administrative/Senate Taskforce on Undergraduate Education in a Research Context

Relevant to Diversity

o Academic Advancement Program Reports:
  ▪ Student Perspectives on the UCLA Academic Advancement Program, Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER), October 2004
  ▪ AAP self-review prepared for the Academic Senate, February 2005.
  ▪ Undergraduate Persistence and Graduation Reports
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- Graduate Division reports
- Reports dealing with faculty gender and minority equity
  - *Gender Equity Issues Affecting Senate Faculty at UCLA, Report of the Gender Equity Committee, October 10, 2000* (Currie & Kivelson)
  - *Promoting Faculty Diversity at UCLA, April 2002*
  - *Report on UCLA’s Efforts in Aid of Diversity in Faculty Hiring and Achieving Gender and Minority Equity, May 1, 2001* (Gender Equity Data Committee Final Report, University of California, Los Angeles, Winter 2003 (Bastani et al.)
  - *An Assessment of the Academic Climate for Faculty at UCLA, Gender Equity Committee on Academic Climate, April 2003* (Siegel, et al.)
  - *Gender Equity Health Sciences Compensation Committee Final Report, University of California, Los Angeles May 28, 2005*
  - *Women In Science and Engineering Summit, Summary of Issues and Recommendations, May 13, 2005*
- *Faculty Diversity – Guidelines for an Academic Plan, May 2003*
- Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Diversity Annual Reports
- UCLA Academic Affirmative Action Plan, 2004-2005
- Reports on Academic Preparation

**Relevant to Performance Indicators**
- Announcement of establishment of an institutional research office reporting to the chief planning officer
- Reports of the 2004 and 2005 Performance Indicators Taskforces
- Key Academic Indicators (KAIs)
- Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Surveys
- UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) reports
- 2005 Senior Survey results
APPENDIX D
UCLA Reaccreditation Timeline and Workplan
(As of August 31, 2005)

2004-05: WASC Steering Committee appointed/begins drafting Institutional Proposal
• ALO leads Steering Committee subgroup to January WASC workshop
• Steering Committee meets monthly
• Potential topics identified and subgroups meet to define topics
• Refined topic descriptions considered by Steering Committee
• Three topics (Capstone, Interdisciplinary, Educational Technology) considered appropriate
• Planning Group holds (Co-Chairs, Vice Provost for UG Education, and ALO) retreat, develops
draft Institutional Proposal, and shares it with full Steering Committee

2005-06: Executive approval of Institutional Proposal/vetting with Academic Senate and Deans
• Steering Committee meets and approves draft Institutional Proposal
• Chancellor and Provost review and approve Institutional Proposal
• Draft Institutional Proposal completed & sent to Chancellor Provost
• WASC Planning Group meets w/ Chancellor/Provost
• Website containing key reference materials and ongoing work of taskforces made available to
campus
• Provost sends Final Draft Institutional Proposal to Academic Senate/Deans to begin formal
consultation process
• Reaccreditation Process/Institutional Proposal discussed in Academic Senate Executive Board,
Deans' Council, Chancellor’s Executive Committee
• Detailed consultation processes within Academic Senate and administration defined and initiated
• Ongoing institutional processes informed and enriched by themes although final approval is
pending
• Comments from Academic Senate/Deans/VCs considered and changes made to Draft
Institutional Proposal
• Institutional Proposal approved by the Chancellor/Provost
• Institutional Proposal submitted to WASC
• Theme leaders identified and theme taskforce members appointed
• Institutional Proposal reviewed by WASC Proposal Review Committee (i.e., approved or
revisions requested)
• Institutional Proposal revisions made if necessary

2006-07: Formal work on Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) and Educational Effectiveness
Review (EER) begins
• Institutional Proposal and reaccreditation workplan presented to key groups, e.g., Legislative
Assembly, Deans’ Council, Chancellor’s Executive Committee
• Theme taskforces and Coordinating Committee appointed and begin work in monthly meetings
• Staff support named for each Theme
• Director of Academic Information Management chairs workgroup to assemble data, reports and
other information for Portfolio
• Progress reports and workplans presented to key groups, e.g., Legislative Assembly, Deans' Council,
Executive Committee
• ALO consults with WASC liaison to identify potential Team Chair and members
2007-08: Focus on Developing C&PR Portfolio and C&PR Visit

- Lead writers selected to draft integrative essays
  1. Theme 1: Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience
  2. Theme 2: Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research
  3. Theme 3: Using Educational Technology to Enhance the Student Academic Experience
  4. Review of Progress on General Education
  5. Review of Progress on Performance Indicators
  6. Review of Progress on Diversity
  7. Strategic Planning and Budget Process
  8. Academic Senate Program Review at UCLA
  9. Educational Effectiveness Indicators

- Integrative essays vetted within taskforces, Coordinating Committee, Academic Senate, and administration

- Final Portfolio (integrative essays, evidence, etc.) prepared and submitted to WASC (Winter 2008)

- Presentation to key groups, e.g., Legislative Assembly, Deans' Council, Executive Committee

- Spring C&PR Visit and Team Report

2008-09: Focus on Developing EER Portfolio and EER Visit

- Lead writers selected to draft integrative essays on three themes:
  1. Theme 1: Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience
  2. Theme 2: Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research
  3. Theme 3: Using Educational Technology to Enhance the Student Academic Experience

- Integrative essays vetted within taskforces, Coordinating Committee, Academic Senate, and administration

- Presentation to key groups, e.g., Legislative Assembly, Deans' Council, Executive Committee

- Final Educational Effectiveness Report (essays, additional evidence, etc.) prepared and submitted to WASC (Winter 2009)

- Spring EER Visit and Team Report

- Final Commission Letter
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